THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE desperate state of the world to-day and the problem of bringing to the birth a new and better order is a universal concern, and especially so to the Christian Church. What contribution has the Church to make, and along what lines of action should she move, if she is to be true to her divine commission and at the same time intervene with maximum effect in human affairs? These are questions which require the most profound and prayerful consideration.

A book has recently appeared, *Worship and the Common Life*,[1] by Mr. Eric HAYMAN, M.A., which approaches the subject from a somewhat unusual angle. The writer, who is a Quaker with a strong sense of the catholicity of the Church, believes that the Quaker testimony and general attitude to life has something of great value to contribute to the solution of world problems, that without the guidance of the Inner Light men and nations are doomed to stumble on in the dark.

There is a great measure of unanimity among serious writers as to the causes which have led to the present world chaos. In his 'Secular Despair and Christian Faith' Fr. A. R. Vidler says, 'We have already reached the saturation point in diagnoses of the present situation, and one can hardly pick up any theological book nowadays without feeling that somewhere one has read it all before.' The Renaissance carried its assertion of human freedom too far, even to the extreme of asserting human independence of God. As Berdyaev has said, 'It freed the creative forces of man, and gave his powers their highest expression in art, and in that it operated within the realm of truth. But it also separated him from the spiritual fountains of life; it denied the spiritual man, who cannot but be a creator, and affirmed in his place the natural man alone, the slave of necessity.' Modern man, avidly believing the Tempter's promise, 'Ye shall be as gods,' and feeling no need of divine control, set to work with demonic energy to build the most gigantic Tower of Babel the world has ever seen, and we to-day behold its mighty downfall. To us comes the call to arise and build better, more wisely, more humbly, and upon some surer foundation. This is our task unless the world is to lie in permanent ruin, or rise only to experience another overthrow.

How are we to go about this task of the renewal and integration of the social order? At once there will leap up in every Christian mind such words as these, 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord,' and 'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it.' Yet when it comes to actual practice and the shaping of programmes the irrepressible spirit of man is ready again to assert itself as sufficient for the task. By international agreement, by legislation, by some happier arrangement of the framework of society it is hoped that the old order can be patched up and again made a going concern. An illustration of this may perhaps be found in the report of the Church of Scotland's Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis. After three years of deliberation the Commission has reached very definite conclusions on the need for political, economic, and social reform, while 'the important question of the Church's enterprise of evangelism' is declared to be 'still under review.' Surely a case of pushing the cart well in front of the horse.

Is it to be thought that the present world-malady can be cured by any such means, however the violence of its symptoms may be allayed by them? 'It is surely obvious that the lines of recovery must diverge far more sharply and consciously from the lines of degeneration.' The war which has wrecked the world is essentially a manifestation of a conflict which is spiritual and eternal, and must be fought out on that level. We must seek an integration of life which shall carry in itself the negation and defeat at every stage of those forces which have caused its disintegration. This leads to the suggestion that 'the expression of Christian life and the apprehension of Christian faith and thought in the Religious Society of Friends offer a type of Christian communion which is inherently different from the whole trend of modern civilization, and which is more easily capable than other forms of Christian expression of offering a pattern within which worship and the common life may be integrated into a comprehensive and creative society.'

[1] Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net.

The meaning and implications of this can only be briefly indicated here. There must be a profound integration of worship and the common life. Man is so related to God that no satisfying explanation of his nature is possible from the purely human side. His view of the world ought always to include an outlook upon the eternal. All his activities ought to be undertaken in conscious dependence upon the guidance and help of the Spirit of God, or as the old prayer put it, 'begun, continued and ended in Thee.' 'While the tests of fruits and of ethical conduct must be applied to any outlook on life which claims to be creative, or of general validity, these tests must never be so viewed as to focus attention upon the human achievement. This man or this society is not creative and fertile because it has acquired a disciplined experience enabling it to the works of Christian charity. It is creative only when it is united to the Divine Charity in a joyous and creaturely relationship. In a true sense, though they would deny all such intention, those who stress the disciplined achievement of man and society are laying an emphasis which is legalistic, and are thereby defeating their purpose of establishing man's freedom.'

While man is thus intimately related to God, having at the core of his personality a spark lighted at the altar of heaven, he is also inextricably bound up with his fellow-men. The individual exists only in this relationship. The isolated self is an abstraction. If this dual relationship creates a tension, as it actually does, it must never lead to a conflict of loyalties, to a separation of worship and the common life. God must be supreme in every sphere and all our activities in the Church and in the world must be consecrated to Him. 'At a point in his ascent through the heavens Dante received a revelation of special wonder, which evoked from him a new and total self-dedication in response. He was shown a cross set in the midst of heaven, on which Christ was seen. There were two streams of moving light, one passing up and down the vertical arm of the Cross, the other stream stretching along the outflung arms of the Cross. The key point of his vision was the meeting-point of these beams of light, where Christ Himself was found, still hanging upon the Cross, in token of its eternal quality. Then Dante became aware of unearthly music, to which his ears were not yet attuned, but he realized that it was a hymn of lofty praises, and it brought to him the command "Arise and conquer." In that vision our present meaning is ideally expressed. Whatever the human and temporary limitations placed upon the Body of Christ by the failure of its members, there is still the central and absorbing function of worship in which are blended and inseparable the joy of adoration and the energy of sacrificial service. If these are ever separated in our thinking, we are merely saying that the Church must balance its activities between religious observances and the energy of good works directed to humanity. At once we lose the power which the Church possesses by her innate nature; it is within the field of a total worship that her life is realized, her function expressed and her divine nature vindicated. At no point in such worship, in the sense in which we are here considering it, can the motive of adoration be expressed out of relation to the need of the world for God. At no point in the service of that need can any motive other than that of adoration be at work.'

'A religion which bases itself upon a supernatural revelation of truth claims an authority which transcends any that can be drawn from human reason. But this does not mean that it is contrary to reason or even that it can safely dispense with reasoned argument. This is orthodox Christian teaching, and it is only in an age which has witnessed a sort of concerted attack upon the validity of reason that it seems necessary to recall a fact that was admitted by Calvin as much as by St. Thomas.'

The author of those sentences is Professor J. A. K. Thomson, M.A., who was in the Chair when Gilbert MURRAY delivered on March 19, 1944, his Conway Memorial Lecture—*Myths and Ethics*;[1] and the sentences themselves are from the Foreword with which he introduced the lecturer (and the Foreword is a remarkably discerning and felicitous tribute to the lecturer).

Mr. Thomson shares with Gilbert MURRAY the fear, and he believes that a great many serious-minded people—whether Christians or not—share it also, that unreason has been invading religion in the contemporary world. Accordingly, he thinks that Christians should accept the invitation which Gilbert MURRAY extends to them and meet him on the common ground of reason. For Christianity, as he says above, is not contrary to reason nor can it safely dispense with reasoned argument.

Gilbert MURRAY begins by recalling that Moncure Conway, who opposed slavery before it was fashionable or safe to do so, stood for humanity and that in renouncing successively his Methodist and Unitarian ministries he stood also for truth or sincerity of thought. He goes on to affirm that since the opening of this century humanity and truth have gone; and this he attributes not

[1] Watts & Co., London; 1s. net.

to any loss of belief in the Christian religion but to war.

'It is war, first the approach, the threat and dread, and then the reality of war that has undermined our humanity.' 'I am not wishing to blame either individuals or Governments, merely to register the fact of the progressive inhumanity of this war-poisoned age.' It is 'the logical result of totalitarian war.'

'It is not our godliness or lack of Christianity that made us go to war. We went to war with profound reluctance because we had to fight for our national freedom and for the preservation of all we held sacred; but when once we were involved in war we learnt the lessons set to us by what Thucydides calls "that tyrannous schoolmaster."'

'As with humanity so with truth. Truth and war are incompatible. In wartime it becomes vitally important to deceive the enemy, to conceal some things, to misrepresent others, to create an atmosphere which is helpful towards winning the war and not at all concerned with objective truth.'

But Gilbert MURRAY seems to allow nothing to the distinction between the acts of inhumanity and deceit to which war drives us and the spirit of humanity and truth which may none the less abide still within us. In any case he concedes that inhumanity and deceit are essentially repulsive to normal human nature. This is indeed evidenced by the intense reactions towards ideal justice and higher moral perfection that tend to follow upon long periods of war. 'In Comenius and Grotius they clothed themselves in Christian language; in the Stoics and Plato they used that of the current polytheism. In China they will be Buddhist or Confucian.'

While Gilbert MURRAY cannot enrol himself among Christian believers, he pays tribute to the 'sublime ethical outlook which Christianity to some extent shares with other religions or philosophies but has expressed with quite peculiar simplicity and splendour.' And he finds his deepest emotion stirred and his fullest assent commanded by the appeal of various Christian leaders on certain of the gravest problems raised by the war.

'When the Bishop of Chichester appeals for help to refugees, for greater efforts to rescue before too late the victims of Nazi terror, for considered action to alleviate the starvation of our allies, for constant remembrance during the war of the human society that will be left after the war, I feel, while making all allowance for immediate military considerations, that, permanently, this is the army to which I belong, this is the faith for which I stand.'

Where he differs from the Bishop and other Christian leaders is in the reasons for this faith. Whereas they fall back on a 'myth' in explanation of the precious quality of Christian civilization (his statement of the Christian 'myth' is, by the way, not unexceptionable), he has learnt of Copernicus to rid himself of anthropocentrism and to base his faith on humanistic and empirical grounds. And yet he frankly admits that it is a faith, and not a scientific certitude.

As the conclusion of the Lecture shows, the distinguished Lecturer is despite his agnosticism nearer to Christian theology, at least of the broad or liberal type, than we are apt to think. His appears to be not an anti-religious but a religious agnosticism. It may be true that, as he says, it is the 'myth' that divides him from orthodox Christian belief; but even conservative Christian theology—as represented, for example, by Reinhold Niebuhr—recognizes the place of 'myth' in Christian belief in a way which perhaps he does not fully realize, and which carries with it a consciousness of the limitations of dogma of which he would thoroughly approve.

But let us hear the appeal he makes to adherents of the Christian religion on the ground of a common religious agnosticism: 'We who believe above all things in Humanity and Truth, and those Christians whose religion rests far more upon, say, the Sermon on the Mount and the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians than on dogmas and miracles and magic claims, have exactly the same conception of our duty to mankind, the same vision of beauty to be pursued; and those, I venture to think, will pursue it best, who, in the prophet's words, "Walk humbly with their God" and do not profess to know what is beyond man's knowledge.'

When did our Lord reach His divine self-consciousness? And how did this experience come to Him? Clearly, it came to full expression at His baptism, but it must have been born long before that and must have been maturing during the silent years. It may be that we must be content with ignorance on the subject, but we cannot help wondering, and a humble and active imagination may not be without its help. And this is the kind of help which Mr. Geoffrey HOYLAND gives us in his very remarkable life of Jesus—*The Great Outlaw*.[1]

In his chapter on the boyhood of Jesus Mr. HOYLAND (who, by the way, is a schoolmaster) says that, while Jesus was in every respect completely 'wholesome,' He had a reputation for being 'queer.' That was what His own people

[1] S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net.

said of Him: 'he is beside himself.' And the foundation for this reputation was that He was aloof, that there was something in Him that set Him apart, an experience that others did not have, unconventional ideas, a thought of God very different from that of the religious teachers.

Mr. HOYLAND thinks that this must have come to Him quite early in His boyhood. And it came to Him in this way. He began to notice something special in His surroundings. It might be a flower, a butterfly, a lizard, or even a stone, but there was something that came out to Him and a *life* flowing into Him. And as this experience developed the world about Him became more alive and real. Its life and His were linked together and He could touch and feel the hidden life throbbing in everything. And He felt this as a *creation*. This was the difference between the thought of God in the religious world and His own. The conventional idea of God was static. The vision that came to Himself was creative life.

It would be a mistake to try to sum up what the carpenter's Boy was learning in the terms of modern science or modern thinking. He knew nothing of science and He thought largely in pictures, like an Oriental not like a Greek or an Englishman. What He was discovering was a living God. All the time He was thinking about the world He knew what was happening *from the other side*. He saw God creating, and He saw also that the life God created sometimes turned *against* the main stream of the divine creative purpose, and that there was a constant effort to turn this back on its right course. Creation and re-creation (or redemption) were part of the same *divine activity*.

Almost inevitably Mr. HOYLAND has himself been putting all this in terms of modern thinking. But, of course, he does not suggest that the Boy Jesus thought out consciously in His boyhood these ideas. But they must have been part of the experience that was coming to Him ever more clearly. And as His experience of the world of people widened, the sphere of the divine activity widened also. It included people. After His visit to Jerusalem at the Passover the clear vision of God working everywhere must have embraced the events of that memorable time.

The crowds in the Temple, the Elders, sitting aloof in their semi-circle, grave and withdrawn, the Roman soldiers, the beggars in the streets—these were all parts of the vision. It included them. It could not but include them. For the essence of the great experience which was born in Jesus' boyhood and developed in the twenty years later was just that God is everywhere. It is this same experience that made it possible for a modern Christian, G. K. Chesterton, to say: 'Have you ever known what it is to walk along a road in such a frame of mind that you thought you might meet God at any turn of the path? . . . The axe falls on the wood in thuds, "God, God." The cry of the rook answers it, "God." The crack of the fire on the hearth, the voice of the brook say the same name. All things, dog, cat, fiddle, baby, wind, breaker, sea, thunderclap, repeat in a thousand languages—God.'

It was when He perceived this clearly that Jesus began to know what His work was to be. He knew then that these men and women He had seen, and His own boy friends, were the most precious and the most delicate of all the works of creation and that in them God was making something of supreme interest and value. And He knew, too, that He Himself cared for people now more even than He cared for the wild things that had first given Him His vision of God.

He knew that He could understand these people because of what He had seen of God in the world. He saw that the life that was flowing through all these people was more inclined to turn against its true source and oppose it than any other form of life, and that this somehow was the cause of sin and suffering. And He felt that there was no joy in the world to compare with the joy that came from the creation of a beautiful human spirit and above all when one of these was turned from darkness to light. And when this came to Him He saw that His work was to lie among men and in this divine enterprise.

What He did during the years that followed the experience that has been described we do not know. But we may be sure that He carried through to completion in His own mind the 'tremendous piece of thinking' that had begun in its simplest and barest form on the hillside at Nazareth and had received a vivid stimulus during the visit to the Passover, and that before He went out on His mission He was not only sure of His faith and His task but that He had fused into one whole the vision of His boyhood and the knowledge of human suffering and failure which came through His daily experience of men and women.

The New Order.

IV. The Church's Ministry in the New Age.

By the Reverend Canon Roger Lloyd, M.A., The Close, Winchester.

At no time in the history of the world can the Church ever be free from her primary duty to proclaim the Gospel to the people whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. Whether social conditions are hell on earth, as now in the occupied countries of Europe, or whether they approximate to heaven on earth, as they never have done yet but some day may, still the Gospel has to be proclaimed. The broad principle of the method of making this proclamation, and of the ministry of shepherding which goes with it, are by now so clear and so decided that they will not be seriously disturbed by whatever form of social organization happens to prevail at any one time. For example, there is in the idea of ministry through some form of parochial system a timelessness and a continuity which makes the organization of the Church quite inconceivable without its parishes. But while that is true, while the Church's ministry must never be dictated by any given form of social organization, none the less it must always be profoundly influenced by it. The Gospel is a Gospel to society as well as to the individuals who form it, and Jesus died to save the world just as truly as He died to save me. The shape which the world takes must plainly have much to say to the shape which the Church's ministry takes. It therefore follows that in any age the Church must have a policy, no matter how general the terms in which she states it and makes it clear to herself. But it must be a continuing and developing policy because of all institutions the Church is the one which has the most need to peer ahead into the future, and to descry, if she can, the changes and chances of the forms and the organization of this fleeting world.

But peer into the future as much as we may, it seems impossible at this moment to say with any certainty what form the new order of society after this war is going to take. Some say that we have passed through a revolution and are now at the end of it. These prophets do not claim to know what shape of society is about to emerge, but do say that it will be static in comparison with the extreme fluidity of society during the last two hundred years. Other prophets, with just as much right to judge, furiously deny this and claim that the revolution is only now beginning, and must go on unfolding itself for at least one or two generations ahead. The one thing which is now quite certain is that we are entering into a completely new world, but it is as yet wholly uncertain whether that world is going to be better.

The feature of this new world which at the moment looks likeliest is that collectivism in some one of its forms will be the keynote of its organization. The idea of the omni-competent State has by now won its victory quite decisively, at any rate in England. It was brought into existence by the votes of a predominantly Conservative House of Commons, and for some years now it has been quite happily worked by the conservatively minded. The whole conception of a planned society, even the idea of economic as well as political international co-operation, must take this omni-competence for granted, for without it, it could not be. There will be no getting away from that. Everything, therefore, depends upon the application of this omni-competence, and that is just what at this moment no one can possibly foretell. On the one hand, there is the universal agreement that planning with all that it means is likely to be the condition of bare survival in the chaotic years that must follow the end of the fighting. On the other hand, there is also a very healthy distaste for bureaucracy, with its queues and its endless multiplication of forms and officials. Such of the planners as fail to demonstrate that their particular nostrum will in fact lessen obtrusively bureaucratic control, do away with the queues, and tear up the forms, may very well be cutting their throats.

Only two things now seem certain. The first is that we are unlikely to see anything like a stable society in the next twenty years. The second is that we are certainly in for a conflict between the traditionally and the revolutionary minded. Whether this conflict is to be the healthy tension which is essential to all true development, or whether it will be the wracking and purging hatred which can end only in the desolating victory of one side or the other, is something which we shall have to wait to see. But in any conflict between tradition and revolution the Church must be involved, and in that setting the Church is likely to be disliked by both sides because the only part that she can play is that of a mediator, being fitted to do so by the exact

balance of the two elements in her own faith, and no mediator in the history of the world has been much liked by the partisans. The likelihood is that this may still further disturb the prevailing form of the ecclesiastical system, and it may very likely strike still more serious blows at the economic position of the clergy, which is already serious enough.

In such an atmosphere the Church will have to exercise her ministry to-morrow. She herself will come to it already compromised in one important particular, namely, the extreme oddities of the present ecclesiastical system, at any rate in the Church of England. These oddities which cramp our ministry so dreadfully are mostly found in the two spheres of patronage and finance, and the disheartening fact about them is that practically everybody acknowledges them to be sources of great weakness, and yet it seems so appallingly difficult to get them changed within reasonable time. In any case it is very hard to suppose that they could be changed without the suffering of a period of considerable confusion, and the confusion will fall most heavily upon the Parochial System. There is, moreover, another most important element of confusion which may be forced on the Church, and this is Disestablishment. The Archbishop of Canterbury has recently said that we ought neither to ask for nor to fight the disestablishment of the Church, but leave it to the decision of the Government of the day. It may well be that later on a Government will come into power which decides that the Church must be disestablished, and if so, it would be great folly not to reckon with the fact that Disestablishment must almost certainly involve a more or less severe measure of disendowment. No amount of citing of the precedent of the Church of Wales can alter the fact that, however mild these measures may be, there is bound to be still more confusion for a good number of years, and that this confusion again will fall most heavily upon the maintenance of the Parochial System.

For all these reasons it seems to follow that a new and better deal for the Church must depend upon the leadership of the laity, and their enthusiasm on a far greater scale than at present to do the evangelistic work of the Church as a whole. It is largely they who will have to lead us, and one of the signs of hope is that this lay leadership is fast coming into existence. One has only to mention in passing the names of C. S. Lewis, Dorothy Sayers, and T. S. Eliot to show that a considerable part of the prophetic and teaching ministry of the Church is now being discharged by lay people who have shown themselves to be most fully equipped to discharge it. The laity as a whole, moreover, are not compromised to the extent that the clergy must be by the oddities of the ecclesiastical machine. They also lie outside the strange conditions which so often cramp the ministry of the clergy—inequity of pay, the patronage lottery, the vast vicarage and its garden, and all the rest of it. They are free, as we hardly can be free and shall not be free for a good many years to come.

None of this is to be read as constituting any reason for attempting to scrap the present ecclesiastical system, or as any judgment that in the future there will be less place than now for the Parochial System. Whatever happens, the Church of England is parochially organized, and when it is organized round some other system it will hardly be the Church that we have known. The need is not to do away with the Parochial System, but to supplement it by something else, and when that happens, the relationship between the two will have to be rather carefully thought out. If it be granted that the Parochial System can no longer bear the weight which immemorial time has laid upon it, what then is its function likely to be in the future? It will surely have two supreme duties to perform which cannot be performed in any other way except by and through a series of parish churches. The first of them is the provision of a centre of worshipping community for all the people. It is worth remembering that in modern Britain there is one place, and only one, where one can find a completely representative sample of the people of a place gathered. That place is its parish church. Nowhere else do people of all classes and all ages from infants to grandparents come together and perform the same acts in common, sing and say the same words, utter the same prayers, all directed to the same God. Thus the parish church provides a kind of communal mimesis which is essential to the life of any community, and which cannot be provided in any other way. Public worship is the occasion of this provision, therefore the first duty of all duties of a parish church is to make its worship come alive and to be always gathering a congregation for it. No amount of extension of the work of the Church in other spheres by the laity can ever compensate for failure in this primary sphere, which is predominantly the sphere of competence of the parish priest.

The second supreme duty of the parish church in the future must be the provision of convinced and converted lay people, who must do so much of the work of the Church, and to provide their training until they are fit and able. There never was a time, of course, when this has not been the duty of every parish church, and where there are lay people who, having found Christ, are presenting Him to the world outside, at least ninety-nine

out of a hundred of them found Him through the ministration of some parish church or other. Those who are loudest in their denunciation of the Parochial System in the name of God ought sometimes to remember that most of what they know about the God in whose name they denounce the parishes, they owe to some parish or another.

But side by side with this there will have to be a new kind of ministry altogether, the nature of which is being dictated by the urgencies of the shape of the existing social situation, and this ministry must be exercised almost completely by lay people, since only they can get into the places where it has to be done. The Archbishop of Canterbury has lately said that while half of the ministry of the Church is to bring the challenge of Christ to this person or that as separate individuals, the other half is to implant into the general culture of the social organization of our age the spirit of the Gospel. In 'another place' (as the Epistle to the Hebrews would put it), he has said that the general shape of the society we know is a field of competition between units of social power, and the size of these units is steadily increasing, and as it increases they become less and less personal and more and more communal in form. It follows, therefore, that a vital part of the evangelism of the future must be to win for Christ not only the separate persons who constitute these centres of social power, but the centres themselves in their own total character. Institutions like the B.B.C. and the National Union of Railwaymen have a soul, and their soul is something more than the totality of the separate souls which go to make them up. How can the challenge of God be offered to an institution like that? There is only one way—it is by implanting at their centres cells of the Christian people who work there, and then by doing everything possible to make sure that these cells are truly infectious. Furthermore, because the institution to be won is communal in shape, so also the Christian power to be implanted within it must be a disciplined community, however small it is. It is perhaps worth remembering that the technical language of the Church and the technical language of the world have only one word in common, and that word is 'community.' The Church and the world alike believe in community and mean very much the same things by it. It is the only word that both hold in honour, and therefore that is the place to start. From that we can draw out one vital evangelistic principle; it is that whereas evangelism used to be thought about as a movement impinging upon the circumference from without, it must now be thought of more as a movement of expansion from within the organism to be won. Sometimes I think that we would do well to mark that vital principle by substituting for Christian evangelism the phrase 'Christian expansion.'

If the Church in the new age must think of its characteristic proclamation of the Gospel as expansion from within, and if this is in line, as manifestly it is, with the actual facts of the situation, then it is clear that the right approach is some form of cellular expansion. No wonder then that while innumerable experiments are going forward, almost every one of them is one form or another of just this. They are too many to count, and far too many to enumerate. They have only this in common, that they believe the Gospel must be entrusted to the keeping of a group of people rather than to the keeping of separate people completely in isolation. It is, after all, significant that Christ promised His presence 'where two or three are gathered together,' and when He said, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world,' it was to a community that He said it. Some of these cells are completely unorganized, and have no communication or touch with each other. Many, on the other hand, live by a fairly stringent rule of life, and accept the spiritual direction of some priest whom they trust. A good many are loosely banded together in a larger fellowship of groups of the same kind, and maintain touch with each other. The *sine qua non* of them all is that they must have a very high standard of fellowship, for without it they will never arrive at a common mind. The time has not yet come to make any attempt to co-ordinate the various cellular experiments that are going on, though probably they ought to be more aware of each other than they are yet.

Now the beauty of this method of cellular expansion from within is that it is quite independent of whatever fortunes may yet fall upon the ecclesiastical machine. Let there be Disestablishment with the severest measure of disendowment that was ever thought of, it would make no difference to the functioning of cells of this kind. There is, moreover, no need of any kind of elaborate organization for them. The less organization the better. Even when there are a large number of such groups all subordinate to the same movement or society at work up and down the country, there is no need for anything more than a really first-rate secretary by way of organization. It is the cheapest way of spreading the Gospel that exists, and it is a form of Christian activity which can be carried on under any circumstances whatsoever.

No one, however, ought to suppose that because this way is simple it is therefore easy. No small group of people banded together for a common purpose has more need of selfless patience than

has a group banded together for this kind of Christian cellular expansion. Experience of eighteen months with such groups of cells has shown quite clearly that it always takes such a group eight or nine months before it can arrive at a programme of action, and in that time it will probably have made at least one mistaken choice, and so have to go back to the beginning and start again. There is also a real danger of friction between the classical ministry of the parish church and this new ministry. This is inevitable, and partly it is the tension without which there can be no creative health, but it can easily be carried to the point where it does hurt both to a parish and to the little group of Christians within it. It is so easy for them to get into the habit of supposing that their business is to be the gadflies of God, pushing their stings into every parson for miles round; and it is so hard for many clergy to make the venture of faith which is required before they can really bless the best of their lay people upon an adventure which they themselves cannot control. Sooner or later there will have to be a very careful defining of the relationship between the older and the younger form of Christian ministry because each is vital to the existence of the other. Probably this is the next step we should take.

Jesus in the Quran.

By the Reverend John W. Drummond, B.D., Edinburgh.

Two translations of the Quran have special interest to-day. One is the translation by Maulvi Muhammad Ali, and the special interest of it is that the translation and commentary reveal the new attitude of the Ahmadiyya movement[1] and in particular their polemic against the divinity of our Lord, against His death on the Cross, and against His Resurrection. The other is the translation by Dr. Richard Bell which gives us the first thoroughly critical arrangement of chapters and verses to which the Quran has been subjected. It also supplies us with a careful, detached, scholarly translation[2] by the aid of which it is possible to test some of the Maulvi's conclusions and claims.

What does the Quran say about Jesus? 1. The Quran's favourite title for Jesus is Son of Mary. The Quran is not quite clear who this Mary is. She is the daughter of the wife of Amram, the father of Moses (3^{31}), and the daughter of Aaron (19^{28}); no doubt being confused with Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron. Maulvi Muhammad Ali to avoid this apparent inaccuracy translates 'wife' as 'woman' and says Mary was descended from Amram and belonged to the priestly house of Aaron.

The Quran is very emphatic in clearing Mary from any Jewish slanders. That such slanders were made is clear from 19^{28} where the Jews say to Mary as she comes to them carrying the child Jesus, 'O Mary, thou hast committed a thing improper! O daughter of Aaron, thy father was not a bad man nor was thy mother a harlot.' The Quran in two places quotes Mary as saying in astonishment to God's messenger who announces that she is to have a son, 'How shall I have a boy?' (3^{42} 19^{20}). The Maulvi instead of 'How?' reads 'When?' The plain reading of the account in the Quran leads one to see that there were but two alternatives, namely, either Mary had a son out of wedlock, which suspicion is strongly repudiated and Mary's chastity vindicated, or else there was a miraculous Virgin Birth by the power of God. But the Maulvi will not accept the plain reading of the Quran, and in order to make Jesus no more than an ordinary man, he strives very unconvincingly to wriggle round the difficulties, maintaining the virtue of Mary, but at the same time disclaiming anything supernatural about the birth of Jesus.

Again, at least twice in the Quran Mary and her son are referred to as a 'sign' (21^{91} 23^{52}), which suggests that there was something unusual about the birth of Jesus. Mary is also described as 'chosen above the women of the worlds' (3^{37}). And the natural inference is that while the Quran

[1] The founder of the Ahmadiyya movement was Mirza Ghulam Ahmad who in the latter part of last century claimed to be the Messiah of the Jews, the Christ of the Christians, and the Mahdi of the Muhammadans. He sought to combat Christianity by showing that Jesus was merely a man who died a natural death in old age in Kashmir, thus cutting at the central Christian doctrines of the Cross and the Resurrection. Though disowned by orthodox Muhammadans this movement has been very aggressive and has even established mosques in the West, *e.g.* at Woking. Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B., translator of the Quran is president of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya movement.

[2] It is this translation of Dr. Bell which is used throughout this article.

is strongly opposed to Mariolatry (5^{116}), it clearly holds that Mary and the Son she bore hold so high a place in the ranks of humanity as to be unique. This inference is more in line with the orthodox Muhammadan reading of the Quran, but the Maulvi sees the danger of such exaltation of Mary and her Son, and is at pains to make the Quran say something other than its plain meaning.

2. The Quran quotes Allah as saying, 'We gave Jesus, Son of Mary, the Evidences' (2^{81} 2^{254}). The Maulvi translates 'Arguments.' What are the Evidences? They might be the Evangel, the Gospel. But the word refers more naturally to the miracles which Jesus did—His deeds rather than His words. The Quran tells plainly of His wonderful works and specifies (i) His speaking to the people in the cradle (3^{41} 19^{31-34}); (ii) His creating birds (3^{44} 5^{110}); (iii) His healing the blind and lepers (3^{44} 5^{110}); (iv) His bringing the dead to life (3^{44} 5^{110}); (v) His gift of the Table ($5^{112-115}$), whatever the Table may mean, but it seems to mean the perpetual feast of the Holy Communion. Leaving aside this last doubtful work from our discussion, let us note that the Maulvi will not accept the Quran's reading about Jesus speaking in His cradle, but refers that to a later date when Jesus was grown up, that he will not hear of any but Allah 'creating,' and understands the healing of the sick and raising of the dead only in a spiritual, not in a literal sense. But this calm elimination of these mighty works will hardly do, for those who were present and who did not accept Jesus' divine mission, said of these miracles, 'This is nothing but magic clear' (5^{110} 61^{6}). Something had been wrought which could be accounted for only by magic on the part of the unbelievers, or by divine power on the part of believers. And it should be noted that where this accusation of working magic is brought, in both cases it is closely and clearly related to the Evidences. Jesus wrought works which could be accounted for only by magic or which were Evidences—the power of God bearing witness to His Messenger and setting His seal upon His message.

3. Allah, according to the Quran, aided Jesus or supported Jesus by the Holy Spirit (2^{81} 2^{254} 5^{109}). What is meant by the Holy Spirit in Islam has been a problem to all students. There is no doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Strictly speaking, with its rejection of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, there is no place for the Holy Spirit in a rigidly mathematical monotheism.

At times the Holy Spirit seems to be the Angel Gabriel as in *v.* 19^{17}, 'We (Allah) sent to her (Mary) Our spirit, who took for her the form of a human being, shapely.' Elsewhere the Holy Spirit is more clearly divine, as 'We breathed into her (Mary) some of Our Spirit' (21^{91}). The Maulvi prefers to translate 'Holy Spirit' as 'Revelation,' but on the other hand he is not averse to identifying Muhammad with the Holy Spirit. In an extraordinary note on 2^{254} where Muhammad is not mentioned at all, the Maulvi gives high praise to Muhammad, the only reason for this outburst being that he sees in the support of Jesus by the Holy Spirit corroboration of Jesus given by Muhammad! And, as might be expected, like all Muhammadans, the Maulvi sees in Jesus' promise of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, a prophecy of the advent of Muhammad. This is due probably to the confusion of the words paraklētos (the Greek word in the Gospel text translated Comforter) and periklutos which means praised and therefore means Ahmad or Muhammad, but is not the word used in the Gospel.

It is interesting, if rather saddening, to find to what lengths men can go in controversy. For in their ardour to disclaim and disprove the divinity of Jesus, they are not apparently averse to ascribing similar dignity to Muhammad, although to do so is contrary to the teaching of the Quran. The Maulvi with manifest approval says that both David and Jesus spoke of the advent of the holy prophet Muhammad as the advent of God Himself and further claims of Muhammad, 'He is perfect, and by pointing a way enables others to attain to perfection. In this sense he is called a "shafi" or an "intercessor."' Here is surely the process of deification of a human being.

At which point it is somewhat of a surprise to recall that Jesus is called in the Quran, 'His (God's) Word which He casts upon Mary and a Spirit from Him,' (4^{169}); 'a Word from Himself (God) whose name is the Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, an eminent one in this world and the hereafter, one of those brought near' (3^{40}). The Maulvi has difficulty in explaining these terms, 'Kalimah' and 'ruh,' saying they mean 'prophecy' and 'inspiration.' There is no understanding at all apparently in Islam of the title Messiah and its significance, and it would seem that these titles of Jesus, Word of God, Spirit from God, Messiah, have been taken over without any realization of what their application to Jesus involved, and they have been retained although they really give Jesus that exalted place which Muhammadans deny Him when they reject the name Son of God, understanding that name only in a carnal sense. And they have a verse of the Quran to support them. 'The Christians say that the Messiah is the son of Allah . . . Allah fight them! How they are involved in lies' (9^{30}). The Maulvi perhaps feeling the fierceness of this attempts to mitigate its ferocity by translating

'Allah destroyed them' or margin, 'May Allah curse them.'

4. The Maulvi's great aim is to prove that Jesus did not die on the Cross. This colours all his thinking. Even so innocent a verse as 3^{41} is made to serve his purpose. 'He (Jesus) will speak to the people in the cradle and as grown man.' The Maulvi reads 'When of old age,' which proves for him that Jesus did not die at the age of thirty-three, but lived to a sufficiently old age. The orthodox Muhammadan view has been that Jesus was not crucified, but another was substituted for Him at the time of the execution, and He was taken up alive to heaven. This is borne out by 4^{157} which says 'they did not kill him and did not crucify him, but he was counterfeited for them.' The Maulvi however explains: 'The word does not negative Jesus being nailed to the cross, but it negatives his having expired on the cross as a result of being nailed to it. That he died a natural death is plainly stated in 5^{117}.' But when we turn to that verse it is not so explicit as we were led to expect. It reads 'Thou didst take me to Thyself.' That may be a euphemism for death but we cannot assume that with certainty when it is precisely that point which is at issue.

In 3^{48} the language also is uncertain. 'Allah said, O Jesus, I am going to bring thy term to an end'—a rather vague expression. So that while the Quran does indicate that Jesus did die—His death is mentioned in 4^{157} and 19^{34}—it leaves a great deal of ambiguity about it.

The Maulvi is equally anxious to establish that Jesus did not rise from the dead. But this finds no support in the Quran. Here its testimony is unhesitating. 'Allah said, O Jesus, I am going to bring thy term to an end, and raise thee to Myself' (4^{48}). 'Nay, Allah raised him (Jesus) to Himself' (4^{156}). 'Thou didst take me to Thyself' (5^{117}). 'Jesus said, And peace be upon me the day of my birth, and the day of my death, and the day of my being raised up alive' (19^{34}). True the Maulvi tries to explain this away by saying that 'raising' means 'exalting' in degree and in praise, not in place and in direction, but it is not very convincing, and on 19^{34} he has no comment to make at all.

It is difficult to see how the Maulvi can reconcile his views with the Quran. It is difficult therefore to see how he can hold the views he does and still be a Muhammadan. It is another indication of the difficulty forced upon Muhammadans by their own sacred book. To take its testimony seriously is to be made to think very seriously about Jesus, for despite the distorted picture there given something of His glory cannot help breaking through. And to stop that testimony it is necessary for the Maulvi to change the Quran and make it say other than it does. Perhaps if he were examined by Dr. Jung, the Maulvi would be classed among those Jews in whose psychoses the celebrated psychologist was constantly finding one element to be resistance to the Cross.

True it is that there is a want of consistency in the Quran, for this book which calls Jesus the Word of God contains also the passage where Jesus is represented as saying to God, 'Thou knowest what is in my (inner) self, but I know not what is in Thy (inner) self; verily it is Thou who art the knower of secret things' (5^{116}). How far removed is that from the sublime sayings of Jesus in the Gospels. 'All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him' (Mt 11^{27}). 'I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me' (Jn 14^{6}). 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (Jn 14^{9}). 'I am in the Father, and the Father in me' (Jn 14^{11}). 'The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth' (Jn 5^{20}). 'I and my Father are one' (Jn 10^{30}).

There speaks the authentic Word of God and we see the full implication of that title.

It is not in the borrowed ray that we can see the perfect light, but glimpses can be caught even there which might lead eventually to the clear shining of the truth.

Literature.

A MASTER OF TRINITY.

Isaac Barrow: His Life and Times (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), by Mr. Percy H. Osmond, introduces to the present generation a name that is largely forgotten. Yet Isaac Barrow was an able man of extraordinary versatility. John Evelyn speaks of him as 'that excellent, pious, and most learned man, divine, mathematician, poet, traveller, and most humble person.' Perhaps it is his extraordinary versatility that has been the undoing of his name and fame.

We are grateful to the biographer for a very careful and readable work, embellished with four

interesting illustrations. The successive chapters introduce us to the Lad of Mettle, the Scholar-Cavalier, the Wandering Scholar, the Double-barrelled Professor, the first Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, the Preacher, and the Master.

Isaac Barrow's was a comparatively short life (1630–1677), but it may be justly described as spanning the greatest dividing range in English history. Our author is, however, obviously content to sketch the historical background in bold outline only, if so be he may dwell the more upon the actual portrait of his hero. And he certainly succeeds in leaving a distinct impression upon the reader's mind of the life, if not so distinct an impression of the times, of one who proved his ability in natural science and mathematics, in classics, and in theology and the art of preaching, but who is perhaps best remembered for his pious foundation during his Mastership of the new Library at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Here is what is recorded in the catalogue of Benefactors, read at the annual Commemoration Service at Trinity: 'Dr. Isaac Barrow, Master, in 1675 engaged the Society in the bold and magnificent design of erecting a new Library far more spacious and beautiful than the old Library in the Great Court. To his zeal, and to the support of many members and friends of the College, and in particular of the architect, Sir Christopher Wren, we owe the erection of the present stately building.'

But lest we be misunderstood, we hasten to say that while this biographer leaves us with a more distinct impression of the life than of the times, he illustrates and enlivens his theme with many an historical instance. Indeed in his desire to be interesting he tends to fetch his instances from afar. For example, he remarks apropos of Barrow's inaugural Oration as Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge that it develops only one of the three reasons for studying Greek given by Dean Gaisford in Christ Church early in the nineteenth century: 'It enables a man not only to read our Saviour's words in the original tongue, but also to look down with contempt on the vulgar herd, while it often leads to posts of considerable emolument.'

There appears to be an expression of regret in these pages that this anti-Papal, anti-Calvinistic divine did not live to carry the administrative ability he showed at Trinity College into the See of Ely: 'Stimulated by the grace of Episcopacy, Barrow might have stood out more prominently in ecclesiastical history as a large-minded and courageous moderator in the difficult times which were ahead. On the other hand, it is within the bounds of possibility that he might merely have irradiated a crepuscular glow from the episcopal bench in the House of Lords.'

W. Fulton.

A book that is difficult to estimate is *The Unrest in Religion*, by Erasmian (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It professes to raise the questions that are being asked widely and urgently to-day about the basis of our Christian faith. In particular it discusses four problems: our knowledge of Jesus, the story of the Gospels, the making of the Creeds, and 'the inevitable issue.' The difficulty in judging the book arises from the sympathy one naturally feels for any one who is facing reality and testing it. This anonymous layman, who is a member of the Church of England, has obviously read very widely and his reading has completely undermined any confidence he ever had in the Gospels and in the traditional belief about our Lord. And it has produced a sceptical attitude that spares nothing and leaves exceedingly little that can be called reasonably certain. It is told of the late Professor A. B. Davidson that a young man once called on him to discuss his (the youth's) religious perplexities. Dr. Davidson could not get him to accept anything at all. When he was going away he turned to the Professor and said: 'It's a fine day, Sir.' 'Oh,' said the 'Rabbi': 'Are you quite sure of *that*?' Well, there is hardly anything in this book of which we can say the same.

The supernatural birth goes, of course. So does the Eucharist. So do the stories of the Crucifixion; the only thing certain is that Jesus was crucified (the writer is 'quite sure of *that*'). The Resurrection also. He is sceptical of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians ('if we may take this as his'). He uses freely the old stunt of 'interpolation.' Paul's words about the Eucharist were interpolated. Indeed the most surprising thing about 'Erasmian' is that he remains a member of the Church of England, and that he takes any interest whatever in Christianity. There is no doubt that in his book he displays a great deal of ability and a wide culture. It may be hoped that his inquiring mind will yet enable him to grasp something in Christianity that is true on which he can plant his feet.

In an interesting book by a South African Padre, the Rev. George Nicholson—*Spotlight on Springbok* (The Citadel Press, Cape Town; 2s. 6d. net)—tells the story of his experiences with the troops in North Africa. It is a series of vivid pictures, full of humanity, of truth, of humour, and tragedy. This record from the religious angle is as fascinating as any war correspondent's despatches. It is the man in the army from the inside, the individual and especially the Springbok. An extract is made from it under 'Entre Nous.'

Canon C. E. Raven in a foreword to *Women in the Pulpit*, a collection of twenty-three sermons and addresses by representative women preachers, says: 'It is the fact that women are actually discharging pastoral, priestly, and prophetic functions, and that their work is being used and blessed by God, which has been to us the primary ground for the conviction that the Church cannot without hypocrisy refuse them ordination.' In noticing this collection of sermons—the first of its kind, we believe—we gladly take the opportunity of drawing attention to the society which exists to secure equal opportunities for men and women

in the official service of the Church. It is an interdenominational society and among its Vice-Presidents is Canon Raven (address : 22 Porchester Place, London, W.2). The activities of the society include the publication of literature. But for the inception of the present volume we seem indebted to the enterprise of the editor, the Rev. D. P. Thomson, and the publishers, Messrs. James Clarke & Co. It is, in itself, a powerful argument for bringing to an end the exclusion of women from the Ministry. Its fine quality will be best appreciated, we believe, by reading one of the sermons and we have quoted, in 'The Christian Year,' part of the Rev. Dorothy F. Wilson's study of 'Awareness of God.'

Perfect Love, or Christian Perfection, by the Rev. W. H. Wardle, B.A. (Epworth Press ; 6d. net), is a little book whose aim is to set forth in simple and Scriptural language John Wesley's doctrine of Christian perfection. The doctrine is illustrated by quotations from the experience of some of the early Methodist preachers. The booklet should prove to Christian people an incentive to higher living through more whole-hearted faith.

An article in a Supplement to 'The Christian News-Letter' by the Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins roused some discussion, and by way of clarifying his point, and also other points which he did not develop, he has written a book which he calls *Prayer and the Service of God* (Faber & Faber ; 5s. net). In a sense the book is an introduction to the whole subject. The author discusses the previous questions : Why we find prayer so difficult *to-day*, its theological foundations, its complete dependence on the Bible, its place in the concept of the Church, and its relation to God's will. The whole exposition is on a high level of thought and devotion, and the general treatment as well as that of particular topics is unusual. This war-time has occasioned many books on prayer but the present one is not superfluous. It will answer many people's perplexities and its orthodox theology will reassure many people's minds.

Some time ago the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin, M.A., D.D., General Secretary of the London Missionary Society, issued a little book, 'Under Fire,' in which he gave a well-informed account of the position of the Christian Church as it stands to-day under the assaults of a hostile world. He has now written a sequel, *Into Action* (Livingstone Press ; 2s. 6d. net), in which 'the Christian Church is seen preparing itself for the positive roll of advance.' It might be described as a kind of reconnaissance to survey the territory into which the Church must advance and the opposition it is likely to meet. The writer deals in turn with six of the greatest problems with which the Church will be faced at the close of the War. These are the Jews, Church and State, Freedom of Religion, Colonies, Herrenvolk, and Youth. On all of these vast problems Dr. Chirgwin writes with knowledge and sound judgment. His style is clear and his statements singularly informative and well balanced. His book, though modest in size, deserves careful study not only by Christian people but by all who have at heart the welfare of the nations.

Professor H. H. Rowley, of the University College of North Wales, Bangor, whose reputation as an Old Testament scholar is rapidly growing, has published four lectures (amplified in places and supplemented by footnotes) delivered at the Vacation Term for Biblical Study held at St. Hilda's College, Oxford, in the summer of 1943. The lectures are entitled *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (Lutterworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net). They trace the development of Apocalyptic Literature from its roots in the Prophetic Writings of the Old Testament, and then go on to examine that development in detail, beginning with the Book of Daniel and ending with the Book of Revelation, the non-canonical books being included in the survey. So far this is familiar ground, but it is covered with the most recent aids, and we can think of no better introduction to the study of the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. The concluding section of the book provides the author with the opportunity of indicating his own standpoint as an interpreter of Apocalyptic. It is a standpoint which enables him to concentrate on the broad features of the hope of these tractarians for evil times, and on the spiritual principles that underlay their work. 'Instead, therefore, of casting aside these works in an age of tribulation that drives others with false presuppositions to them, we are able to find them speak a relevant word to us just because they spoke a relevant word to men in like days.'

The Unknown God, by One Who Loves Him (Pickering & Inglis ; 6s. net), is a book written in a very earnest spirit with the aim of making known to the reader the grace of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. It is very closely Biblical, every page being sprinkled with Scripture texts. It is also abundantly supplied with illustrations, many of them gathered from the writer's own experiences in many lands. The call to faith and full surrender is lovingly and insistently pressed. The book should prove helpful to many.

'We have rediscovered the Church, we need to rediscover the significance and function of the local church, so that ordinary members of local churches shall understand what a local church is and what it means to be a member of the Church.' So the Rev. Alan T. Dale writes in the preface to *Rediscovering the Local Church* (S.C.M. ; 2s. 6d. net). The author wishes to answer questions like these : What makes my church a *church* ? What is its origin and what is its end ? How is it different from the club that meets round the corner ? Briefly : *what is it ?* In answer to such questions Mr. Dale gives us a fine description of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church (expounding each point fully) and then says : 'Your church at Z—— Street is part of this.' There are excellent

suggestions for discussion at the end of the book which fit it to be a good medium for exchange of views in a study circle.

The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary (University of Chicago Press ; 9s. net) is Volume II. Number 3 in ' Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament,' edited by Dean Colwell. The author is Mr. Bruce M. Metzger, Ph.D., Instructor in New Testament, Princeton Theological Seminary ; and the work involves substantially two chapters of the author's doctoral dissertation submitted in 1942 to the Classics Department of Princeton University. By far the larger part of the dissertation was concerned with the examination of a hitherto unedited Greek Gospel lectionary (Gregory 303) in the Library of Princeton Theological Seminary. The main body of the work before us has to do with the textual affinities of the Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in this lectionary. Those Lessons are selected as representing an area common to both varieties of Greek Gospel lectionaries : one having lessons for every day in the week throughout the year ; the other daily from Easter to Pentecost, but during the rest of the year for Saturdays and Sundays only. Dr. Metzger makes a careful comparison of the Saturday and Sunday lessons in ' Gregory 303 ' with the Neutral, Western, ' Cæsarean,' and Byzantine Texts. He concludes that probably the lectionary text for this area of Saturday and Sunday lessons from Luke was constituted from a New Testament text which was predominantly ' Cæsarean ' (pre-Cæsarean) in character, and that the ' Cæsarean ' element was gradually eliminated from the lectionary text, which became proportionately more and more like the Byzantine text.

What a Man Can Believe, by the Rev. James D. Smart, Ph.D. (Westminster Press, Philadelphia ; $2.00), is described as ' a book for laymen.' It fitly answers to this description. It consists of a series of ten addresses or chapters dealing with the main articles of the Christian faith. Without any special brilliance or originality it expounds the truth with great clearness and good sense. It is evident that the writer has a sound knowledge of Reformation doctrine with leanings towards the teaching of Karl Barth. He is master of a good English style and his method of handling his topics should commend itself to thoughtful readers.

The Width and Length of Words.

By the Reverend Professor Norman H. Snaith, M.A., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

Nothing is more difficult, or more fraught with peril, than to translate from one language into another. If one word in one language always meant exactly the same one thing, no less, no more, then the part of the translator might perhaps be smooth, provided that in the other language there was one word which always meant precisely that same one thing. But this never happens in a living language, and no language ever dies which has lived to possess a literature. The written word does but hold captive the living thought of one mind until other eyes set it free to spring to new life in other minds.

No translation can ever accurately represent the original, for every word in each language has its own history, its own colour, its own ethos. The new rendering is adequate only in so far as the spirit of the original author has lived again in the translator. This is the secret of those superlative translations of the Greek classics which Sir Gilbert Murray has given to men. Another type of translation is Edward Fitzgerald's *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, of which men say there is more of the translator than the translated. The Bible is betwixt and between. In as much as it enshrines the living Word of God, it has a life of its own into whatever language it has been translated. Always it is born again, a new creation. Apart from this, the adequacy of any of the versions depends upon the translators being able to say with the Apostle Paul ' We also believe, and therefore also we speak ' (2 Co 4^{13}). At the same time the full message in all its richness can never be truly reproduced in any translation. That is why there must always be a place for the study of the Bible in the original tongues in which it was written, and in the major versions in which it has been transmitted from generation to generation. On this account there is room for the development of what we may call Etymological Exegesis as an additional medium through which more light and truth may break forth from the Word. In this way the sharper and more distinctive elements of the preaching of prophet, psalmist, historian, evangelist, apostle, may be retained. The mortal peril of translations is that the distinctive elements may be blurred into general traditions of all tongues and peoples.

There are three main difficulties of the translator from the purely etymological point of view—the width of words, the length of words, and the accidents of assonance. The greatest difficulty of all is the transference of the teaching from one world of thought into another which may be com-

pletely different, but this is not a translator's problem so much as a theologian's.

1. The Width of Words.

Some words have width. By this we mean that the meanings of a word can cover so wide a range that its various meanings have no apparent connexion, and may indeed be as far apart as the poles. The link, in such a case, is an original significance, perhaps long since lost, or perhaps still extant, but in another language. Our example of this is the Hebrew root מלט (*malaṭ*).

For the fundamental idea of the root we must turn to Arabic, where the first form of the verb means 'having scanty hair.' The causative fourth form is applied to birth, and can mean 'casting the fœtus without hair,' with another extension to 'escaping with the narrowest possible margin.' We may expect to find some or all of these meanings in Hebrew. Whether or not the word ever had the meaning 'having scanty hair' in Hebrew we do not know. The simplest (qal) form of the verb is not found in the Old Testament, nor in the Mishnah and the Talmud. Nothing can be built upon the fact of its absence. There were doubtless many words extant in old spoken Hebrew which are not found in the comparatively small amount of ancient Hebrew literature which has survived the accidents and the assaults of the centuries. Even of the words which have survived, many twists and turns of expression may be lost.

The meanings of the root in Hebrew are dominated by the idea of slipping through with the smallest possible margin. The hithpael form is found in Job 41^{11} (E.V.V.^{19}) of the sparks which 'leap forth' (R.V.; A.V. has 'leap out') from the mouth of Leviathan. Septuagint has *διαρριπτοῦνται*, by which they probably meant 'are shot through,' but a Greek who knew his Plutarch and his Polybius would explain the Greek word as meaning 'scattered around.' Xenophon uses the word of a dog wagging his tail, and Polybius of scattering nuts and money amongst a crowd. The idea of the Hebrew is of sparks forced at high speed through the monster's clenched teeth. An excellent example is 2 S 4^{6}, where the verb is used of the escape of the two murderers of Ish-bosheth, or better still, if we follow the Septuagint, of them slipping past the drowsing slave-girl at the door. The *διέλαθον* of the Septuagint conveys exactly this meaning, and there is not the slightest need to assume that the translators read נלאטו or indeed any word other than נמלטו. Another example is 1 S 20^{29}, where David slips away, speedily and unobtrusively, to the family feast at Bethlehem.

This idea of escaping by the smallest possible margin goes back to the fourth form in Arabic, 'giving birth to the fœtus without hair, and so escaping, as we would say and as Job 19^{20} says, 'by the skin of the teeth.' See also Gn 19^{17} of Lot's flight from Sodom, and 1 S 18^{10}, when Saul very, very nearly pinned David to the wall with his spear. Neither Lot nor David had any time to spare, and with David it must have been a matter of a fraction of an inch. According to Ps 33^{17} not even the war-horse by reason of his great strength can manage to deliver his rider, though by the smallest margin.

The use of the root in connexion with birth is a development of the idea of 'slipping through.' This is seen in Is 34^{15}, where the verb is used of the arrowsnake laying her eggs. Another case is Is 66^{7} where the parallel verb is ילד, the ordinary root for 'giving birth.' Here the idea of a speedy slipping through appears again, for the birth is no ordinary one, but of exceptional quickness. 'Before her pain came, she was delivered.'

And so the word can be used of a last-minute rescue. This explains the name of the island of Malta. Its Greek spelling Melita is the Phœnician מליטה, which the historian Diodorus Siculus (5, 12) explained as meaning *καταφυγή* (refuge). It was the place into which sailors could slip for safety in time of storm. The word thus finds its place in the salvation-vocabulary, and is used for God's salvation of Israel or Israelite in its most urgent aspect. It shares this duty with פלט (break through), חלץ (draw off), and פרק (tear away). There are five cases where God is the subject of the verb. In two of them, Is 31^{5} and Jer 39^{18}, the sense of urgency is present, but not particularly important, it being used in parallel with נצל (emit violently, eject, though usually translated 'deliver'). The other examples are Ps 41^{2} 107^{20} 116^{4}, where the idea of urgency was doubtless present to the psalmists, though we are able to view the whole affair with equanimity.

We have left until last Is $46^{2.\,4}$, because in these verses the neglect of the special significance has led to mistaken exegesis. The Revised Version reads, 'Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth; their idols are upon the beasts, and upon the cattle: the things that ye carried about are made a load, a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity.' So much for *vv.*$^{1.\,2}$. The translation of the preposition *lamedh* by 'upon' is perhaps unusual, but it is sound enough, for it makes the sense clear. The idols which once were carried upright in the religious processions, are now laid flat on the backs of beasts of burden. But these beasts themselves, weary with their dead load, themselves bow and stoop, and are not able to slip through

and escape with their burdens. Compare Ps 33^{17} (above).

So far, so good, but the same root occurs in *v.*[4]. In the English Versions it also is translated 'deliver,' and there is nothing to indicate that it is used in a wholly different sense from that in *v.*[3]. The same applies also to the words 'carry' and 'bear,' for these also are used in two senses in the two verses. *V.*[3f.] has nothing at all to do with *v.*[3]. It speaks of God carrying Israel in the belly, as a woman carries her unborn child, but carrying him for long, long years, even to old age. God will keep on carrying him, until in due course and in His own time, He will give him birth, however long that may be delayed. The root should be translated 'give birth' in *v.*[4]. This, as we have seen, is the meaning in Is 34^{15} 66^{7}. The translators have all been misled by the editor of Second-Isaiah, himself or another. The editor has used the root as a link-word, and so has placed the paragraph which begins with *v.*[3] next after that which ends with *v.*[2]. The result has been that the translators and the commentators have tended to read *v.*[4] as though it was in contrast with *v.*[3]. The Babylonians and their beasts could not deliver Bel and Nebo from captivity, but God can and will deliver Israel. The editor, if he was not the author, may possibly have intended this, but the author did not. The Revised Version is quite right in beginning a new paragraph at *v.*[3], but the separation of the two sections should be more apparent in the translation. Actually there are three link-words in these verses. Mowinckel noted the other two, 'carry' and 'bear,' נשׂא and עמם, but not this third.[1] Here we have, therefore, an additional item in the cumulating evidence that the prophetical books are not long, continuous books, but are composed of short sections or oracles, strung together for the most part by means of link-words. Sometimes the sections are very short indeed, as has been shown by E. Balla (*Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos*, 1926) and A. Weiser (*Die Profetie des Amos*, 1929) for the Book of Amos, by Mowinckel and W. Caspari[2] for Second-Isaiah, and by T. H. Robinson in his *Hosea bis Micha*, published in Tübingen in 1936.

2. The Length of Words.

The example here is the Hebrew חֵפֶץ (usually translated 'delight, pleasure'). Here is a word which has many meanings, but in this case in Hebrew the growth has been almost entirely in a straight line. The one central thought persisted throughout until the word decayed, and the old meanings have tended to fade off as the new emphases have gathered strength. For the width of the word we must turn to Arabic and Urdu.

Once again we begin in Arabic with an original meaning of 'be mindful, attention.' From this we get a double development in Arabic towards 'protect' on the one hand, and on the other hand through 'attention' to 'excited attention,' and ultimately even to 'excitement,' 'anger' (*chif-aytsat*). In Urdu the idea of protection has developed through 'safety' to 'custody' (*chifazat*).

In Hebrew the development has been in a straight line from the idea of attention, but with a tendency to mean 'delight' rather than 'excitement.' So we find the noun being translated 'delight' as in the name Hephzi-bah (2 K 21^{1}), which, because of its derivation, we would translate '*All* my delight (or the *whole* of my delight) is in her.' The idea of complete attention is never absent until the word definitely breaks down and decays. When the emphasis is on 'longing, desire, delight,' then it is descriptive of a yearning that is strong and dominant. There are no half measures, no half-loves, and nothing lukewarm here. Thus 'the pleasant stones' of Is 54^{12} are picked (LXX ἐκλεκτούς) stones, stones of particular attraction, whilst the 'delightsome land' of Mal 3^{12} is to be associated with the land that is called Hephzi-bah (Is 62^{4}). The fact that 'delight' or 'desire' are far too weak renderings is to be seen in Job 31^{16} where the word is used of the eager longing of the poor, and again in Ps 107^{30}, where the reference is to the sailors coming at last through storms of mountainous waves, to 'the haven where they would be,' as the EVV render it, following the lead of the Septuagint. The word here includes all that nostalgia could ever mean.

Generally in Second-Isaiah the meaning is 'purpose, settled determination, will,' 44^{28} 46^{10} 48^{14} 53^{10}. This significance is particularly important in Is 53^{10} 'and the purpose of the Lord will be accomplished by his agency.' Parallel with the meaning 'will, purpose,' we have the meaning 'business, whole-time occupation,' as in Is 58^{13}, Pr 31^{13} (see margin), and Ps 1^{2}. The last of these three cases is important, since the reference is to the scribe whose full-time occupation is the study of the Law of the Lord. The psalm thus belongs to the same set of ideas as Ecclus 39^{1-11} with its distinction between those who 'maintain the fabric of the world' and whose prayer is 'in the handiwork of their craft' (Ecclus 38^{34}) and the scribe of wide experience and intense study whose 'memorial shall not depart.' The psalm is an introduction, not to the Psalms of David as such, but to the study of the Law, and was placed, we believe, in its present position when the Psalter was arranged as a triennial lectionary, this psalm

[1] 'Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches' in *Zeitschrift f. d. altt. Wissenschaft* (1931), 102.

[2] *Lieder und Gottessprüche der Rückwanderer* (Jes 40–55), (1934).

to coincide with the reading of the first portion in the first year of the cycle.[1]

From this time the word decays rapidly until in Ecclesiastes it means 'matter, purpose, thing' (Ec 3^{1}, etc.), so that in post-biblical Hebrew it came to mean 'thing,' having lost any decisive meaning which once it had. It is now a featureless word, and the idea of 'attention' has entirely disappeared, though in the Targums the idea of 'use, profit' persists as a development from the idea of 'purpose, business,' cf. the Targum of Is 54^{12}, where 'stones of desire' have become 'useful stones,' and the Targum of Hos 8^{8}, where the same word צְרוֹף (use) stands for the Hebrew חֵפֶץ. The word thus has length in Hebrew. It has developed along a continuous line, and has not spread. It has never varied far from the central idea of 'attention.'

3. The Accident of Assonance.

It is notoriously difficult for the translator to preserve an assonance. There is the famous *shod mishshaddai* (destruction from the Almighty) of Is 13^{6}, repeated in Jl 1^{15}, and the rallying standard (*neṣ*) of Ps 60^{6}, which will prove to be only for flight (*hithnoṣeṣ*). Isaiah of Jerusalem also contributes 'and he looked for judgment (*mishpaṭ*), but behold oppression (*mispach*); for righteousness, (*tsedaqah*) but behold a cry (*tse'aqah*)' (Is 5^{7}). There are cases such as Jer 1^{11} where the whole point of the message depends upon the assonance between *shaqed* (the 'waker'- tree, almond) and *shoqed* (I too am awake). But it is rarely possible for the full significance of the original to be maintained in a translation. Manchester Grammar School boys of a former generation will remember 'the Bird's' rendering of κῆδος in the *Agamemnon*. Æschylus refers to the marriage of Paris and Helen as κῆδος, which means both 'sorrow' and 'marriage.' The rendering was 'the match that set the city alight' (l. 699).

The message can indeed be preached without the pun, and no great loss is sustained except from a literary and æsthetic point of view. In the former two cases, however, where the width and the length of a word is not recognized, much of the distinctiveness and something of the fulness of the message may easily be lost.

[1] 'The Triennial Cycle and the Psalter' in *Zeitschrift f. d. altt. Wissenschaft* (1933), 304.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Marines.

By the Reverend A. E. C. Rowan, B.A., Donegal.

'In perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea.'—2 Co 11^{26}.

Soldiers and sailors. You often hear those two words coupled together. It's hard to think of one without thinking of the other. They are often in our thoughts these days because of their many brave deeds. And I wonder which you prefer? Are you more interested in the soldiers than in the sailors? Or is it the other way round? Probably most of you haven't quite made up your minds and like both equally well. And if that's so, you should be specially interested in the men of the Royal Marines. For they are in a way neither soldiers nor sailors—but a bit of both.

A speaker on the wireless said some very interesting things about them recently. They are really soldiers in the service of the Fleet. They go to sea in battleships, aircraft-carriers, and cruisers—just like the sailors. They sleep in hammocks, and one of the first lessons that a young marine has to learn is that he must be able 'to sling his own hammock,' which means that he must always be able to look after himself, no matter where he is. They show that they are soldiers by talking of their quarters on the ship as 'Barracks.' Their badge is a globe surrounded by laurels. They got this badge in 1807 when the King said that they had so many 'glorious deeds' to their credit that 'the great Globe itself' should be their emblem. So you see that they have a reputation for bravery and devotion to duty. A great Admiral once wrote about the Marines and said, 'There never was an appeal made to them for honour, courage, or loyalty, that they did not more than realize my expectation.' That's a great tribute, but the whole record of the Marines shows its truth. For almost three hundred years, since they were first raised by an order of Charles II., they have been doing great deeds.

That seems a very long time ago, children, doesn't it? And yet I think that there were marines long before that. Do you remember our text? 'In perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea.' Doesn't that sound just like a description of the life of a marine—of the life of someone who served both on land and sea? Yet those words were written about sixteen hundred years before the time of Charles II. They were used by Paul to describe some of his own adventures. And Paul was a soldier too—a soldier of Jesus Christ. He was loyal to his Captain no matter where he was. On land he fought against wrong belief and wickedness and all sorts of things. Often people stoned him and beat him, but he never gave in. At sea he fought against fear and remained firm in time of storm and shipwreck. He was always able to 'sling his own hammock' and look after himself through the strength of his Master.

And ever since his time there have been soldiers of Jesus Christ who served their Master on land and on sea. And what about you? This great Captain expects you to serve Him now—on land, where you are. Later perhaps some of you may serve Him on sea. But meantime listen to the motto of the Marines—'By sea and by land'—and realize that for you those words just mean 'everywhere.' You are called upon to fight for Jesus Christ everywhere—at home, in school, at work, and at play. You must always make war against evil of all descriptions. The tradition of the Marines is 'the first to land, the last to leave.' And the tradition of good soldiers of Jesus Christ is 'the first to enter the fight and the last to leave it.' Indeed we as His soldiers must never leave the fight till the victory is ours through the Power of our Captain. We must never leave till the army of Christ has so many glorious deeds to its credit that the great Globe itself will be won for Him.

The Good Shepherd.

By the Reverend Philip W. Lilley, M.A., Rhu.

'I am the good shepherd, I know my sheep and my sheep know me.'—Jn 10^{14} (Moffatt).

When I was in Palestine a few years ago, I saw for myself many of the things I had learned in the Sunday School. I knew, for example, since I was a lad, that in the East the shepherd always went before his sheep, and they followed him. But in the Holy Land I saw this with my own eyes and was struck by the sight. I learned, too, in the Sunday School that in the East the relation between the shepherd and his sheep was much more intimate than was the case in the West. But I never fully realized it until I saw a flock of sheep being scattered by one of our motor-cars outside Jerusalem and then noticed one of them appealing to the shepherd for protection and literally pawing him in its panic fear, as if to say: 'Don't you see the danger we are in? What are you going to do about it?' How dependent the sheep are upon the shepherd!

The true shepherd comes to know and love each one of his sheep. Many of them have pet names. Jesus was only saying what every one knew to be true, when He said, 'He (the shepherd) leadeth them out and calleth his own sheep by name.' He is always with his sheep both in fair weather and in foul, and at sunset he brings them into the fold, where they are counted. But the surprising thing is this—that when they are brought together, the absence of any one is immediately felt. An Eastern shepherd was once asked how he knew if one of his very large flock had gone astray. Would he have to count them all and then discover his loss? 'Oh no,' he said, 'it would be just a *face* that I would miss.' To the stranger who looked upon them, they were but a herd of sheep who could be scarcely distinguished the one from the other. But the shepherd knew them each one. He could say, 'I know my sheep.'

Jesus here claims to be the Good Shepherd. His sheep are just you and me. We think of Him as 'Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep.' When we read this parable carefully, we learn two things. The first is this—the wonderful knowledge Jesus has of each one of us, His sheep. 'I know my sheep.' One of our missionaries tells us in one of his books the answer given by a shepherd who had been asked if he counted his sheep every night. When he answered 'No,' he was then asked how he knew if they were all there or not. His reply was, 'Master, if you were to put a cloth over my eyes, and bring me any sheep and only let me put my hands on its face, I could tell in a moment if it was mine or not.' Jesus knows each one of you like that, just as the shepherd knows the marks, the names, and the ways of each of his large flock. Each one of you is exceedingly precious to Him.

But look for a moment at the second clause Jesus also says, 'my sheep know me.' The sheep get to know the shepherd by following him and listening for his voice. It is his voice that they know, and they very easily discover if any one tries to deceive them by dressing up in their own shepherd's clothes and so attempt to draw them away. George Adam Smith, a teacher revered and beloved, has told us in his book on the Holy Land one of his own experiences. Here are his words: 'Sometimes we enjoyed our noonday rest beside one of these Judæan wells, to which three or four shepherds come down with their flocks. The flocks mixed with each other, and we wondered how each shepherd would get his own again. But after the watering and the playing were over, the shepherds one by one went up different sides of the valley, and each called out his peculiar call; and the sheep of each drew out of the crowd to their own shepherd, and the flocks passed away as orderly as they came.'

Isn't that a wonderful story? But it is even more wonderful to be able to listen for the Master's voice, and follow Him throughout our lives. To know the voice of Jesus means, of course, more than recognising a sound. It means that we know the Shepherd because we love Him. Our hearts teach us this love and we can prove it again and again and again. Never forget that He has proved His love by laying down His life for us.

Jesus then expects you to follow Him with unquestioning obedience. He expects you to trust Him fully. The first Psalm you ever learned speaks of the happy contentment which the sheep has in the great Shepherd. 'The Lord is my shepherd: therefore can I lack nothing. He shall feed me in a green pasture: and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort.' Can you say, 'The Lord is *my* shepherd,' because you know Him? Can you sing from the heart these words?

Jesus is our shepherd:
Well we know His voice;
How its gentlest whisper
Makes our heart rejoice!
Even when He chideth,
Tender is its tone;
None but He shall guide us;
We are His alone.

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Afterborn or Pioneers.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'The people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.'—Dn 11^{32}.

Even now people speak wistfully, sometimes hopefully, sometimes despondently about the times that will come when this war is won. The war will be a great landmark in history. People will call the young folk who survive it, and the children now growing up, the post-war generation.

The ancient Greeks twice referred in this way to a generation, and in both cases they used a rather contemptuous word. Once it is applied to certain Theban warriors. Great poetry like that of Homer had been written about earlier battles than theirs. Seven heroes had fought against Thebes, each at one of its seven gates, until all were defeated. Their glorious names adorned the legend of the grand old days. But the next generation of warriors, who fought more prosaic battles, are not recorded severally. Historians lumped them together in the slightly contemptuous term the '*epigonoi*,' those 'born afterwards.' The word crops up again in connexion with the period after Alexander the Great. Dying at the zenith of his amazing career, that youthful conqueror left his empire to be divided among his leading generals. Writers about the confused epoch which followed are not always at the trouble to mention all their names. They are often grouped together under the rather disparaging epithet, 'the afterborn.'

Now most certainly in years to come people will celebrate the names of those who on sea and land and in the air have proved themselves heroes. But the end of the war will not be the end of great efforts. There will come tremendous opportunities for making old things better and inventing new things, a call and a chance for bold, patient, enterprising, self-sacrificing men and women. It is a mistake to think of the coming years as a dull sad prospect or that there need be a long period of poverty. The wealth of the world is its harvests and its mines and the strength of its labour force, and there will be all the possibilities of new scientific knowledge and the experience of large scale operations.

The time of reconstruction when it comes should be as in France after its Revolution, as in Russia after its Revolution, an exhilarating epoch in which a new generation will make a name for itself in its own way. Those who live on into those years and who grow up then will be worthy of a better title than 'the afterborn.' A finer suggestion for them lies to hand in American literature. There a favourite theme is the story of the companies of men and women who blazed trails through the forests and across the prairies and built homesteads and founded settlements undaunted by privations or danger; and of those in later days who drove roads and built railways across the mountains and took possession of a new land. Americans call them proudly 'the pioneers.' There is a name the post-war generation may set itself to deserve, the pioneers of a better world-order than men have yet known, not 'the afterborn' but 'the pioneers' of a new age.

It is important to foster a right feeling on this point, for emotion is the source of energy. There are two ways of feeling about science. The stories of the achievements of the past, of the discovery of electricity by Faraday, and of microbes by Pasteur, and of wireless by Marconi, may be depressing, as to a small boy who said sighing, 'There will be nothing left for me to discover when I grow up.' On the other hand the contemplation of scientific progress may create boundless expectations of new ranges of knowledge and inventions yet to come.

And there are the same two ways of feeling about the Church. It has its records of martyrs and missionaries, of saints and benefactors, of scholars and preachers of former days. The predominant feeling may be that the Church has had a great past, and must cherish its traditions, and preserve its ancient creeds and monuments and observe centenaries and, for the rest, do well if it carry on in some faithful if undistinguished fashion the habits of piety and good works. But there is also a different way of feeling and thinking and hoping. Great as were many of the achievements of the past, the christianizing of Europe, the building of the cathedrals, the establishment of schools and hospitals, the Victorian outburst of missionary enthusiasm, the history of the Church is so marked by failure and quarrels and compromise that it may be said that real Christianity has never yet had a chance on any large scale, and that to-day and to-morrow members are called to be pioneers of such a loyalty and sincerity and activity in the service of God's Kingdom as will make the Church an effective instrument of God's purpose for mankind.

Expectation to-day should not be of a generation of survivors and little men born afterwards who will potter along in some small way under their burdens and difficulties but of a generation of pioneers, the engineers and architects of a nobler world. Here then is a text for people who have been summoned in language like Bunyan's to fight the giant evils that victory in war will not conquer—Hunger, Poverty, Sickness, Squalor, Ignorance. 'The people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.'

1. The text makes religion the basic element in achievement. The profoundest diagnosis of the cause of the modern catastrophe traces it to the way in which, for the last four hundred years, religion has been more and more pushed out of the world's life. Before the Renaissance of learning men were essentially humble, believing that the key to the right way of living was given through God's revelation. Architecture, music, poetry,

were devoted to the service of His purpose. No human organization or activity was esteemed that did not seem to fit in to His scheme. The modern mind has lost this reverence, and, intoxicated with its new freedom, has taken human reason to be a sufficient guide, and imagined that all that is good or hopeful in the world can be traced to human experiment and reflection regarding what is useful or pleasant. The dark, mysterious power of evil has been ignored and the taint in human nature that can make cleverness a curse. An enormous and unwarranted belief in man's capacity and wisdom and virtue has felt no need and left no room for Divine revelation or heavenly grace. Men have thrust God out of the universe and tried to manage on their own lines and now have discovered that without inspiration or control the end is disaster.

The pioneers must recover and start from the inspiration of religion. God has given in Christ a revelation, the authority and power of which can be recognized by men. It is through those whose minds are open to this guidance, whose hearts are inspired by Divine grace, that the Kingdom of God will come. And let what has called itself Christianity beware of complacency. There may be more real belief in God in an atheism which is practically serving His purpose than in a Christianity that formally recognizes His existence.

2. Further, the text supports the modern conviction that the instrument of God is a community. Righteousness is more than personal honesty or private deeds of charity. Belief in a Heavenly Father involves acceptance of His purpose that men should live in a community of brotherhood, equality, and freedom. The test of genuine Christianity is not only truth but reality—is it actually concerned with the promotion of brotherhood in sharing the good things of life, and equality of opportunity and the freedom of each to lead his own personal life? The promise of future years is bound up with a new sense of community. 'The people that do know the Lord shall be strong.'

3. And there is in the text a note of exhilaration, of joy in action. The moving power of Priestley's play, *They Came to a City*, comes from the impression created that below the wall that backs the stage lies an ideal city with happy homes and children, and music and dancing, and inhabitants without envy or greed or self-importance, and a common life that is fair and free. No more than Priestley does John in the Book of Revelation detail the organization of the ideal city, but he too, in his vision of the holy city coming down out of heaven, suggests that the ideal is not merely in the clouds or in the future but is a community that can take reality now. A world filled with music, in which all serve though no work is done at which men cannot sing and none toil till they are fretted and wearied by their tasks, a world where men live as one community and believe in God and rejoice in labour—have courage all who cherish such a hope! 'The people that do know the Lord shall be strong, and do exploits.'

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Mastering the Relationships of Life.

BY THE REVEREND R. WRAGGE MORLEY, M.A.,
ST. PETER'S VICARAGE, HEREFORD.

'The Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream by night; and God said, Ask what I shall give thee. And Solomon said . . . Give thy servant an understanding heart.'—1 K $3^{5. 6. 9}$.

It was a wise request. If we are going to make anything of life we must have a working idea of things. And it isn't easy. For our human life has connexions outside its own level, both above and below. It is in the relationships with the sub-human, with our fellow humans and with the Divine that we so often get wrong. We are continually having choices forced upon us, and it is a wise man who has settled early the broad principles which should govern life, and has estimated the relative value of things, of other folk and of God in relation to his own life.

1. *Me and It.* We are living in an age when things are being put on the throne. Hours, conditions, comforts, wages—all exceedingly important things—are the first considerations in our plans. What sort of persons we are, and what we shall want to do with these things has by comparison little consideration. Conditions do indeed need alteration. But we are getting to the stage where we are living to make a living, living for things. All the current ideologies have the same motif. Take Communism: it is built upon a philosophy of things; that material welfare being provided all must be well. Of course it has its fine side. It is the common welfare that comes first all the time. But listen to this word from a great Soviet writer, Romanof, in his tale *Three Pairs of Silk Stockings*. Arkady is speaking to his friend. 'I have just been reading, and thought how unused we have become to having our own thoughts. . . . We shall soon be quite empty. We are ceasing to believe in the importance and even in the existence of ourselves as units, because everything around us exists in mass form which has no inner substance whatever. . . . We . . . who still keep intact in the midst of this noisy current, must unite in a sort of Church, so as to preserve our truth, the truth common to all humanity, through this epoch, and save it from destruction. . . . I believe that the soul of man, meeting the eternal truth, feels this truth in spite of everything. Nothing can kill this. . . . We must realize that there are times when a man loses his inner spirituality, and all that remains is the external, the animal, and the mechanical power and capacities; and within—nothing. But I believe that soon man will realize with great anguish the pettiness of external things, and will return to his forgotten soul.' Living under the tyranny of things we chafe and envy and worry and fret, till life holds no satisfaction for us. Others start to be thought of as existing to supply our needs. Rights dominate duties; principles take second place. The world becomes a grasping, struggling bargain counter, from which we try to

snatch what we can. We count up what we have got, and always some one has more; and the war is on. Or we get and are still unsatisfied. Here, for example, is a letter found beside a young fellow who had taken his life in his car. 'From my boyhood I have had everything that I could want. I have had everything bought for me that money could buy. The one thing I haven't found is happiness. Maybe I can find it somewhere else. I think I will go and look for it.'

We need a certain spirit of detachment; a goal outside ourselves. The kind of spirit Garibaldi had when he was an exile in South America. He spent his time in freeing the little republic of Rio Grande. They offered him money, lands, and rewards of all sorts. But he refused them for himself and for his comrades, lest it should tempt him to settle down at ease and forget his purpose and his work for distant Italy. He would not be entangled. We are meant for bigger things than things can supply. We are meant to bend them to our use, to penetrate to the inner meaning of things, to use them only so that we may grow a soul. The human values must come first. Me or It—it is a vital question. But it is one we have the power to settle for ourselves. Our second relationship is not so easy, for it brings in the other fellow. There are two minds at work now, two people making choices. And there are times when we feel as hopeless as Alice at her game of croquet, when the hoops being alive walked away as she shot for them, or the balls, alive too, strolled off as she struck at them, or the flamingo which was her mallet wriggled in her hand. So life seems to get a fresh entanglement when we deal with—

2. *Us and Others.* We ought to understand, for we all have an element of likeness. When we are honest with ourselves we have to admit that at times we are 'not at our best.' We excuse ourselves for the harm we do with 'I never thought.' Our imagination never sees how our indifference hurts others, or we don't care, so long as we have seemed smart or 'let off steam.' But we don't make allowances for the same thing in other folk. So there comes friction, nasty feeling develops, and the world goes awry.

Neither do we make allowances for the differences between us. We expect every one to go our way at our pace, to like the things we want. We are so stuck in the middle of our own picture of life. Though there are millions of them I seem always more important than the other fellow. But if he is thinking the same way what do you expect to come of life?

Then there is this habit of pigeon-holing—lumping people together in a class, forgetting the individual human part, the very thing on which Jesus saw God concentrating. If we would forget all that and look one another in the face with appreciative understanding, the social problem would be largely solved. And with this we must scrap this habit of comparative estimate—he has all that, and I have only this! What havoc that works! 'Second to him, not likely!'

We have got to get a real sense of the togetherness of life into our relationships; a bit of discipline without uniformity; a readiness to give and take, so that self becomes less central and overpowering. Life is too big for us one by one. We are bound up together in its bundle anyhow. And he who lives for himself alone grows smaller every day in the real stature of his manhood. We want the true Christian spirit; the spirit of sharing. And it is important that we get it. For relationships and the world order can never be Christianized unless it starts with a group here and there, that is with you and me. There is our problem—Us and Others. And remember that other one of whatever class or colour is a man with feelings and longings like those we have; he, too, is a potential son of God. For we have got to come there at the end. The fundamental relationship, that which holds the key to both the others is this—

3. *I and Thou.* God! How easily we forget Him altogether as a practical factor in life! And all the while He is the One who supremely matters. When Louis XIV. died, after his tremendous reign, courtiers and dignitaries assembled in their splendour. Notre Dame was decorated to form a great pall for his coffin. The preacher ascended the pulpit, and all movement ceased as he fixed his eye upon them. Wars, arts, pageantry passed before their eyes, all the amazing doings of these seventy-five years, as they wondered how he would deal with them. And then, after a pause his first words came: 'Only God is great!' Men had come to have pride stimulated, to listen to great words of man, and they had been brought face to face with God. The ultimate relationship was disclosed; the perspective completely changed.

How is it that we ignore Him? Perhaps it is because for so many of us He is still away in the past, save when we want a scapegoat for our catastrophes, or enthroned and indifferent in the heavens. We know about Him but we don't know Him. And that is not enough. Kierkegaard has a story of one who came to consult a minister. After listening to the story he went to his shelves and pulled out a book and gave it to him. 'This,' he said, 'is just what you need. It is the most beautiful and convincing treatment I know of the love of God.' 'Alas!' the man replied, 'I am afraid that will not help me much. You see, I wrote that book myself!' Knowledge about God is one thing, personal acquaintance is another. He—the third party—will not do. We need One whom we can address as Thou; One who is with us, by our side, to whom we speak, who has become an inseparable part of our life. Keats, in a letter, says that spiritual things can be divided into three groups—things real, things semi-real, and nothings. And when God is merely He, He is at the most only semi-real. Is not that our trouble? 'Civilization needs a religion as a matter of life and death,' says Bernard Shaw in the preface to *Back to Methuselah.*

It is God we want. And He is here. A myriad voices say, 'We have found Him! Nay we were found of Him.' It is only our blind eyes that

have missed Him, our ears are stopped, we will not hear. Olive Schreiner once pictured the bees over her head taking human form and offering her baby by a touch their gifts—Wealth, Fame, Health, all came, but then came Love and at his coming the babe stirred. You remember the offer Love made: 'In the greatest dark when he puts out his hand he shall find another hand by it. And when the world is against him, another shall say, "You and I".' That is it! I and Thou. It is God's word. Will you have that? If so, it is yours. Only it must be His way you go. You must walk in utter confidence of His company. In step with Him, as Enoch walked with God, thrilled with desiring. 'Father, will you so go with me?' 'Yes, child, henceforth it shall be I and Thou!'

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Time to Think.

BY THE REVEREND FRANK W. MOYLE, M.A., ALLESLEY, COVENTRY.

'Understanding is a wellspring of life unto him that hath it.'—Pr 16^{22}.

I wonder why the old writer, who contributed the only book in the Bible which is an attempt at sketching a philosophy of life, in his list of 'times and seasons' failed to include 'a time to think.' We have, he says, 'A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to mourn, and a time to dance; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing' and, he mentions, 'a time to keep silence, and a time to speak' but he does not suggest a time to think. He certainly had found a good deal of time for it himself, so perhaps he felt that anybody but a complete fool would find it too. But do we? Has not modern life, which is always hurrying us on somewhere or other—and we're never certain where—crowded out our leisure for reflection? Somebody has remarked that modern man is never still enough to reflect anything. Even two hundred years ago Henry Vaughan wrote:

Man hath still either toyes or care;
He hath no root, nor to one place is ty'd,
But ever restless and irregular
About this earth doth run and ride.

I can't imagine what he would think of us now when we find ourselves complaining if the train is late, or the bus is not running, or the morning newspaper is not delivered.

What a glorious opportunity any or all of these things which we call inconveniences can be turned into, if we turn them into a time to think!

Our Reluctance. It is recorded of Jesus of Nazareth more than once that He marvelled at our reluctance and apparently innate laziness in this matter. Even the common wild flowers that your busy feet trample down are worth thinking about.

'Consider the lilies of the field,' He said, 'how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.'

Consider them; study them; ponder over the exquisite workmanship of God in a common wayside flower as Tennyson did.

Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but *if* I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.

Food for thought in a flower or even a blade of grass which God takes the trouble to 'clothe' in a beauty all its own, though it may wither in a day and 'be cast into the furnace' to-morrow. You can trace the same drastic though kindly and almost humorous criticism of men and women and their unthinking ways in some of the stories that Jesus told.

Five bridesmaids missed the wedding breakfast (or supper, because Jewish wedding celebrations went on at night) because they had taken no extra supplies of oil for their lamps—sheer thoughtlessness! A priest and a Levite pass by on the opposite side of the road to where a traveller lay wounded and perhaps bleeding to death in the ditch. And it was not just that they were unobservant, the Levite actually went 'and looked upon him.' Thoughtlessness again. And on the other side Jesus once portrayed an absolute rascal, an out-and-out rotter who swindled his master right, left, and centre, and then proceeded to ingratiate himself with his master's debtors. He could hardly have chosen a more repulsive character, but Jesus did it quite deliberately because of one bright spot in the unjust steward. The fellow used his brains. To a sadly distorted purpose, even to a highly immoral purpose, yes! but he used them. 'His lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely,' which, said Jesus, is more than some good people do, 'for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.'

The Greek philosopher Plato said that the unexamined life was impossible to a true man. Jesus thought the same. He found people playing at life, 'like children sitting in the marketplace' and quarrelling over their games—some wanting to play 'weddings' and others wanting to play 'funerals,' so that neither played at either. He noticed that His contemporaries were particularly good weather-prophets. They would apply their intelligence to trivial superficial things but would not think deeper of the meaning and causes of the storms of human history. 'You can discern,' He said, 'the face of the sky; but you cannot read the signs of this time.'

What is the central challenge of the Sermon on the Mount? Is it not a challenge to re-think your life in His way? Does He not keep driving us back from sins of action to sins of thought, from murder to anger, from adultery to lust, from perjury to prejudice and exaggeration? Thoughts make or mar character. Character determines action. Action makes history. When this new and stricter standard of judgment is widely adopted we shall build a better world; not before!

A Forgotten Incident. We have a most interesting account of how Jesus put that principle of judging motives and intentions rather than actions in a story which does not appear in the Gospels as we know them. In one very important Greek manuscript of St. Luke's Gospel, ch. 6, v. 5, we read the following:

'And seeing one working on the Sabbath, Jesus said to him: "Man, if thou understandest what thou doest, blessed art thou. But if thou understandest not, accursed art thou, and a transgressor of the law."'

When we remember that the penalty for Sabbath-breaking was stoning to death, no one was likely to break it without good reason! Here, Jesus, who elsewhere proclaimed that 'the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath,' and who consistently disregarded the pettifogging restrictions and encroachments upon human liberty which the Pharisees tried to enforce, says in effect to this man:

'If you realize that the law in regard to the Sabbath has become a burden grievous to be borne and that its demands are quite beyond reason and therefore ought to be changed, you are not only not a law-breaker, you are, it may well be, a pioneer of better things. On the other hand to work on the Sabbath, knowing it to be against the law, and to do so with no better reason than "Why shouldn't I?" and a guilty conscience into the bargain is to come into condemnation.'

I wonder how it was that that most precious little saying got left out! Was it some pious and little-minded Scribe or copyist who was afraid that this judgment of Jesus would continue to offend Jewish readers? Whatever the reason for its omission, can you doubt that Jesus said it? It has the ring of authenticity about it. And how important to the understanding of the mind of Jesus!

Private Judgment. Christianity, in so far as it reproduces the spirit and mind of its Founder, proclaims not merely the right of private judgment and decision but the primary duty of thought. Jesus proclaims a time to think. He is the Lord of thought. He promises to all who will use their brains and their intelligence the guidance of the Spirit of the living God who is Truth.

But that guidance and the knowledge of that truth about life and death and the great adventures beyond it will only grow in the favourable soil of minds that have fitted themselves to receive it. They must be like the good soil of a field, clean, deep, and malleable. And that takes time and patience, the alert ear to hear, the open eye to see, and the quiet heart to consider.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Awareness of God.

'Our God is a consuming fire.'—Heb 12^{29}.
'God is our refuge.'—Ps 46^{1}.

When we get assertions like this about what God is we are apt to feel, 'How dare any little man say what God is?' Our fathers would, of course, have accepted such statements about God without question because they were in the Bible. 'For the Bible tells me so' was sufficient reason. But we don't think like that to-day. Rather, our approach to-day is, 'These statements about God are true, because not only these men, but countless men since have found them true in their spiritual experience.' 'But,' someone may object, 'these statements are as contradictory as they can be.'

'Our God is a consuming fire.'

'God is our refuge.'

'Which is the true experience?' The answer is that both these qualities are elements in man's awareness of God, inextricably bound up together, and that we neglect either of them at our peril.

Elements in our awareness of God? But are we aware of God? Many would answer, 'That is my trouble. I am not. When I am with an earthly friend I am immediately conscious of his presence. But this kind of awareness of the presence of God is just what I do not and cannot have. I grant you that may be because He is not present to my senses. I grant you that there are many things that suggest His reality and even His presence—beauty and power in Nature, goodness in men and women, ideals in public life, the life of Jesus as evidence of something behind it. These may be suggestions, intimations of God, if you like, but can you, by any stretch of the imagination, call them awareness of Him, as I am aware of my friend? I know there are great saints and mystics, and indeed many ordinary humble Christians who claim to have had this experience of God, but I have not had it, though I have sought it long, and for lack of it my spirit is weary and I feel like giving the whole thing up.'

Now the first part of the answer to that is that, of course, we cannot expect that a friendship which is mediated through our senses, through our material bodies, should be of exactly the same nature as that of a spiritual relationship which is not expressed through a body or visible to the senses. But if we think for a moment of the conditions of human intercourse and friendship we shall see that there are elements in it which are just as truly elements in our awareness of God. There is what Tennant has called 'a psychical immediacy' in a relationship with a true friend. In a very close relationship or friendship, where there is deep harmony and understanding, words, actions, even looks are not needed to express it.

But there are two more elements in these close friendships, which do enter into our awareness of God: (1) A kind of polarity or tension of wills—two personalities standing over against each other though still in perfect friendship; and (2) a deep harmony, or community, of ideals and values in which our spirits find deep rest. Let us take each of these elements in human friendship and intercourse and ask if they have any counterpart in our experience of God.

First—the rather unusual, but by no means unknown, experience of psychical immediacy. Now let it be said straight away that this is unusual, though by no means unknown in man's experience of God. Some few mystics, saints, humble Christians have it very often. Most of us have it very rarely—apparently in times of very special sensitiveness and need—some never have it at all. Is this because the first group of people are more saintly than the others? Not at all. Some of the finest Christian people have never had it, though their lives are dedicated to the service of God, the fruits of their lives (by which our Lord taught us to judge the reality of religion) are joy, love, peace, and all the specific Christian graces, and wherever they go they influence people towards God and goodness.

But while many people never have this direct experience, there are perhaps more who, like myself, have it just once or twice in their lives, in times of special sensitiveness, or need, or crisis. It comes with suddenness or unexpectedness, flashes into their consciousness. It comes, they say then, like a revelation, or it is a revelation. The literature of Christian biography is full of such experiences, and though to most people they are very rare, they give the whole set and direction to their lives, and for ever afterwards they live their lives in the light of them.

But what we need to remember is that these experiences are exceptional. Are the majority of people then without any awareness of God? No, they are not. For to everyone of us God makes His Presence felt directly in two ways, both of which we are familiar with in our intercourse with our friends. This is what we should expect. Christianity has always asserted that there is continuity in the world of personality and of spirit, that what is central in the one sphere is central also in the other. We could not react in one way to our fellows as personal and in another to God as personal.

So, then, two personalities standing over against each other. This does not mean enmity or disagreement, but that in real friendship one personality is never just a pale reflection of the other. Each is himself, 'with power on his own act and on the world.' The other person's will stands over against ours. It becomes one with ours through free choice and agreement and in no other way.

Now this awareness, in the realm of the spirit, of another will standing over against ours, refusing to force it, but pleading with it for choice and agreement, is a vital fact. Which of us, going through life, is quite unconscious of another will calling us to the choice of certain absolute, sacred, unconditional values?—of an imperative moral demand upon our conduct? Whose will is it that is thus in tension with ours? To the religious mind it is the will of God, 'the will, that is, of the Ultimate Purpose which lies at the heart of all being' and haunts our very soul—which when we reject it is a consuming fire.

But our awareness of God does not cease there. We said that in an experience of human friendship there is always this difference of tension; there is also harmony, likeness, and trust. We are friends because we care deeply about the same things, acknowledge the same standards of truth, honesty, goodness, or beauty. It is that community which gives us that deep sense of rest in the presence of a real friend—that deep experience of him as refuge and as strength.

And these two experiences—of tension and of harmony; of demand and of refuge—are always combined in our experience of awareness of God. While He meets us in moral demand, there is no over-riding of personality about it, for He asks our choice—but in making that choice we come to our true selves. This is the explanation of the great paradoxes of Christianity. 'Whose service is perfect freedom.' 'In his will is our peace'. We are aware of the Holy Will of God, challenging us—condemning us—at times a terrible, consuming fire—but in so far as we don't run away from that demand, but humbly accept it, we find He is our final refuge and strength. Increasingly He becomes for us the air we breathe, the ground we walk upon, the light we see by—Him in whom we live and move and have our being.

> One Lord there is, all lords above,
> His name is truth, His name is love,
> His name is beauty, it is light,
> His will is everlasting right.
>
> Lord of the Everlasting Name,
> Truth, beauty, light, consuming flame!
> Shall I not lift my heart to Thee,
> And ask Thee, Lord, to rule in me? [1]

[1] Dorothy F. Wilson, in *Women in the Pulpit*, 179.

Autobiographical Fragments in the Gospels.

By the Reverend W. W. D. Gardiner, D.D., D.Litt., Caddonfoot Manse, Clovenfords, Galashiels.

In the four Gospels there are, unfortunately, few passages containing our Lord's deliberate unveiling of His own personal thoughts and emotions. The little we have is, however, extremely precious and the study of them, in conjunction one with the other, proves highly significant.

The story of His Baptism by John, as regards its subjective effects, must have come at first hand from Himself; and St. Mark's Gospel which keeps everything in the subjective region contains the most convincing report of this self-revelation. To complete it there is good reason to include the

fragment quoted by Jerome from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Adv. Pelag.*, 3. 2). Late additions to narratives regarding Jesus never predicate of Him anything approaching hesitation or uncertainty, but rather tend to slur over human emotions. The proper introduction to this incident may, therefore, well have been—'Behold the Lord's mother and his brothers were saying to him, John, the Baptist, baptizes unto the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him. But he said unto them, What sin have I done that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless, perhaps, this very thing which I have said is ignorance.' One can scarcely imagine how such a passage ever found its way into any part of the Church's tradition except on the most excellent authority. Peculiar point is given by it to the sequel which narrates how Jesus, on actually receiving baptism, had a unique experience in which He saw Heaven open and the Holy Spirit descending in the form of a dove, and heard also the voice from Heaven declaring Him to be the Son of the Father and well-beloved. Thus was His steady undimmed consciousness of God's fatherhood (His, from boyhood according to St. Luke $2^{40ff.}$) vindicated, not as ignorance, but as true and right. A self-questioning, similar to those we call the Temptations, had come up like a cloud but vanished in a blaze of light. He had yielded to a piety, real enough, though not native to His own religious genius, but His own sense of unsullied communion with the divine returned to abide (cf. Lk 10^{22}).

The Temptations are commonly treated as self-communications of subjective experience and need no new exposition in that light. Their religious aspect is, however, sometimes neglected in favour of purely Messianic conceptions. The sonship of the Baptism was not a theological relationship but an inner personal communion, and thus the question of the first temptation, 'If thou be the son of God,' would seem to press the contrast between spiritual privilege and material want. This was resolved in the consciousness of Jesus, as He revealed, through the conviction that God gives us more than food to live by, so that even poverty can nourish our souls.

The second temptation (according to St. Luke's enumeration) deals with self-questioning as to why divine sonship leaves one yet weak and frail in relation to the powers of the world. The fact was diagnosed that the world was self-given into Satan's hands, with the consequence that to move or sway it, one would seem to need to pay homage to the force that so completely dominated it. Such a suggestion was rejected as utterly false. God must only be served in God's way through complete self-dedication to Him. Later was revealed the expectation of another 'baptism' investing Him with the power to separate men from the domination of evil (Lk $12^{49ff.}$).

The third temptation indicates a passage to the sphere of vocation. The question asked itself how one supremely conscious of God might wrest the sovereignty of the world from Satan to restore it to the divine. Would a signal miracle suffice enacted in a conspicuous place before wondering crowds? The refusal of the mind of Jesus to entertain the idea of an irrelevant sign was complete and final. It was often to be pressed in a way that gave Him acute pain (see Mk 8^{12}) but He knew that true faith cannot be conjured up by mere marvels, but can only be induced by such words and deeds as reveal the nature of God in its own essential spiritual glory.

There are other incidents in the Synoptic narratives which may have been first reported by Jesus Himself. Such an explanation would account for the presence of the story of the Centurion of Capernaum in Q, a collection of the sayings of Jesus, and also for its original conclusion not with the cure of the sick servant but with the words of Jesus commending the Centurion's faith. The words of St. Luke 10^{18}, 'I saw Satan falling from Heaven like a star,' use the same symbolism as the Temptation self-revelations. Occurring as they do in connexion with other Q passages, they may be a genuine saying of Jesus, expressing His joy and hope regarding the mission of His disciples.

Critics have taught us to look in St. John's Gospel for truncated fragments of an early source of primary significance. One must, therefore, note that the visit of Nicodemus is reported as a private one and that any account of it must have come either from Jesus or from Nicodemus himself. The conjecture therefore arises that the incident was used in the teaching of Jesus to give point to His call to all men to seek a filial relationship with God similar in kind to that which He possessed and which, at His baptism, the Spirit had signally revealed to Him as divinely acknowledged. One feels that Nicodemus would have given a fuller story of an event so memorable in his life. The detail and conclusion of the story of the Samaritan woman provide an example, whereas this brief report, passing into general discourse, is just such as a teacher might give by way of illustration of a lesson.

The fragment St. John 7^{1-10} is a fragment indeed, without feet or hands as Wellhausen says, and contradicting what goes before it and follows it by the suggestion that Jesus had done no great works in Judæa and aroused no interest there. It was probably, in its original form, an account given by Jesus of a private circumstance of His

family life. As it now stands, however, we can extract from it only His conviction that the world was wholly given over to hatred of good, but that a time would come when He would challenge the dominion of evil. The repetition of the thoughts of the Temptations is significant.

In St. John 12^{27-32}, as Wendt has argued, the editorial misunderstanding of the phrase, 'If I be lifted up,' since a writer does not misinterpret his own words, is a sure pointer to a quotation from some other document. Also the spirit governing later additions to the Gospel narratives so tends to increase and emphasize the perfect assurance and fore-knowledge of Jesus that the phrase, 'Now is my soul troubled and what shall I say,' may safely be affirmed to be a relic of some primitive source. Since, moreover, in the narrative the voice from heaven is represented as being properly heard by Jesus only, we may regard *vv.*[29. 30] as purely editorial, and reconstruct a self-revelation of Jesus in which He told of momentary emotions of doubt and shrinking which His will dismissed with the prayer of self-dedication, 'Father glorify thy name.'

Then, as He narrated, He heard the divine reply, 'I have both glorified it and will glorify it again,' from which came to Him the assurance that the looked-for hour was at hand. 'Now,' He said, 'is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' The old thought of the third temptation had been sublimated. Not from any pinnacle of the Temple, not by irrelevant signs of power, but by the moral grandeur of His death, exalting faith, courage, and love, He would wrest the dominion of the world from Satan and restore it to God. Whether this was spoken to the Greeks (12^{20}), or to the disciples at some other time, it reads much more like the self-communication of an inner resolution than an onlooker's report of some external event.

In these flashes of autobiography, if one may so describe them, a self-consistent picture of a great and heroic mind is given, and that mind is recognizable as the same Jesus as is portrayed in the Logia and the Petrine reminiscences of St. Mark. In them divine sonship is clothed with a rich religious meaning and does not remain a mere metaphysical idea. Moral greatness is exhibited as victory, not as mere sinlessness. A salvation for the world is planned, but not in the terms of Pauline Soteriology. There is set forth a Messianic vocation, but one that has little to do with traditional apocalyptic ideas. One feels that here is a definite norm, by which must be tested both ancient and modern attempts to tell the story of what 'Jesus began both to do and teach.'

Contributions and Comments.

Note on the Word חצבה in Proverbs ix. 1.

Some modern commentators object to the word חצבה in Pr 9^{1} and, following the Septuagint, substitute for it הציבה, 'she has set up.' See Toy, *Proverbs*, 184, 187; Oesterley, *The Book of Proverbs*, 67. The following passage in the *Midrash Rabba* should remove all doubts and prove conclusively that חצבה is the correct reading. In Exodus Rabba, ch. 15, there occurs this sentence: אדם רואה עמוד נאה אומר ברוך המחצב שנחצב ממנו. 'When a man sees a beautiful column, he says (should say), "Blessed be the quarry from which it was hewn."' 'To hew' is, therefore, the right verb to be applied to a column.

Samuel Daiches.

Jews' College, London.

Proverbs vii. 22, 23.

There are many difficulties in this passage, and I suggest that they can be removed by a very simple expedient. In [22c] read

וּבְעֶכֶס אֶל־מוּסַר אֱוִיל for וּבְעֶכֶס אֶל־מוּסַר אָוִל.

('And in fetters to correction he goeth instead of 'And as fetters to the correction of the fool'). Then rearrange the half lines as follows:

[22a] He goeth after her suddenly [23b] as a bird hasteth to the snare,
[22c] And in fetters to correction he goeth [22b] as an ox goeth to the slaughter,
[23c] And he knoweth not that it is for his life [23a] till an arrow strike through his liver.

The way in which the disarrangement has come about is, I suggest, this. With the Hebrew text before him as the English printed above, the scribe first wrote [22a], and then, because the lines were not straight, his eye travelled to [22b]. Next he naturally passed to [22c] which is immediately under the hemistich he started with; and again because the lines were not straight, he followed it with [23a]. He now discovers his mistake, and inserts the half line [23b] that he has omitted, following it with the last half line of the passage ([23c]).

The substitution of אָוִל for אֱוִיל is not strictly necessary though it gives a better parallel. If this change be eliminated, the sense has been restored by the change of one letter only, כ to ב.

James T. Hudson.

Preston.

Baptism for the Dead.

In the April 1943 issue of The Expository Times there is a note on the much-debated question of 'Baptism for the Dead' (1 Co 15^{29}). The author criticises various interpretations and makes an interesting suggestion. But he does not notice the simplest solution of all, too simple perhaps for general acceptance, that when the Apostle says, 'What shall they do who are baptized for the dead?' he merely means 'what shall they do who have sworn allegiance to one who on their showing must be numbered among the dead?', namely Christ. The most obvious objection is the use of the plural '*τῶν νεκρῶν*.' But it seems to be a Hebraic trait thus to merge the individual in the class, to emphasize his membership in it; as in Mt 9^{8}, where the multitudes 'glorified God who had given such power unto men (*τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*)' *i.e.* to one who was a man. The most striking example is Gn 21^{7}: 'who would have said to Abraham, that Sarah should give children suck?' where the whole point of the narrative is that there was only one such child. If that is got over, exception may be taken to the use of the preposition *ὑπέρ*. Its suitability depends on the preponderance of the idea of personal allegiance in connexion with baptism in the N.T., illustrated negatively by St. Paul's fear that, if he had baptized, his converts might have been thought to be baptized into his own name (1 Co 1^{15}), and allegorically by his statement that the Israelites of old were all 'baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea' (1 Co 10^{2}). All this was illustrated more fully in an article of mine on 'Baptism' in The Expository Times for June 1918. If Christian baptism means sworn obligation to personal service, it may as naturally be regarded as *ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ*, as the believing and suffering 'on behalf of Christ' to which St. Paul applies the phrase in Ph 1^{29}.

Percy J. Heawood.

Durham.

The Wisaga.

A distinguished neighbour, Major C. S. Jarvis, C.M.G., etc., Governor of Sinai, 1922–36, tells me of a Bedouin custom, the *Wisaga*, by which 'an Arab if a traveller should come his way—and his own flocks are far off grazing—may kill an animal from the flock of a neighbour for the traveller's entertainment. This is based on the idea that the laws of hospitality are above all other laws. It of course may only be exercised if the host has no available food and he must make good the animal at the earliest possible moment. Needless to say the custom is very much abused as the animal given to replace that which was killed was always very inferior, and it usually meant a law case.'

This is an interesting light on David and the ewe lamb, but I can find no allusion to it in any commentary.

S. P. T. Prideaux.

Highwood, Ringwood.

Entre Nous.

Church Union in South India.

Re-union by Destruction, by T. S. Eliot (Pax House; 1s. net).

Church Union in South India, by the Rt. Rev. A. T. P. Williams, Bishop of Durham (S.C.M.; 6d.).

South India: The Meaning of the Scheme for Church Union, by the Rt. Rev. Edwin James Palmer, D.D., sometime Bishop of Bombay (S.C.M.; 6d.).

The Scheme of Church Union in South India: A Statement (Church Book Room; 1s. net).

Church Union in South India: The Present Position, by the Rt. Rev. F. J. Western, sometime Bishop of Tinnevelly (Friends of Reunion; 3d.).

Anglican and Free Church Ministries, by the Rev. Canon Gerald Broomfield, D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net).

The question of the coming together into one of the churches of Christendom has never been so manifestly an urgent problem as it is to-day. That is a statement that does not need to be supported by argument. The adherents of other religions are becoming more powerful and, because of their nationalism, more hostile. Very many have declined from being nominal Christians into being non-Christians; and many, proceeding further in the same direction, have become anti-Christian. Thus 'the world' is becoming more deliberately antagonistic and, in consequence, the need is becoming ever more urgent that the Church be one, so that the world 'may know.'

That being the case, a quite minor scheme of union in South India has come to be of great importance. Its importance lies in the fact that it is a plan for overcoming one of the most crucial difficulties in the way of union, the reconciliation of the differences that prevent the coming together of Anglicans with Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists. If a means of reconciliation can be found in South India where the matter has been under consideration for twenty-five years, this will set an example that may be followed by similar groups of churches in all parts of the world.

It seemed a year ago as if this result was about to be attained and the labours and prayers of so many years to have their reward. But just when these hopes were highest events occurred which have brought uncertainty and disappointment. One symptom of the discord that has been created is the outcrop of pamphlets that denounce the plan or defend it, and of these those named above are only a few. The union is opposed by a large

number of 'Anglo-Catholics' on the one side, and a small number of stiff 'Non-Conformists' on the other. The situation that this debate has brought about in South India is at the moment ambiguous. The main problem that has not yet been solved is that of the unification of the ministries in the Episcopal and the non-Episcopal Churches. The first method proposed of bringing that about was that of having an 'interim period' of thirty years by the end of which time the ambiguities of the two ministries would be overcome, as it were, automatically. That plan may be said to have failed, it having been frowned upon by the Convocations of Canterbury and York. But an alternative method may now be tried and may prove more acceptable. The pamphlets that are listed above deal mainly, however, with other objections that are urged against the union scheme. All these pamphlets are by Anglicans, both attacking and defending the scheme.

There have been many pamphlets attacking the proposed union from the point of view of high churchmen, but among those mentioned above only one of these is included. It is by T. S. Eliot and is issued by a body formed for the express purpose of defending 'those fundamental principles of the Catholic Church' endangered by the union proposals. The Bishop of Durham replies in another pamphlet in which he says that Mr. Eliot has produced 'a philippic rather than an exposition' and that 'its often contemptuous language should not be allowed to create prejudice against the scheme.' Here are two sentences from Mr. Eliot. 'Twenty years to build what is only an elaborate artifice! Twenty years to construct a pantomime horse!' It is disappointing to find anyone approaching this subject in such a spirit; but 'who would not weep if Atticus were he?'

We may leave Dr. Williams to deal with Mr. Eliot. The next pamphlet is perhaps the most interesting and important of them all. It is by Bishop Palmer who, when he was Bishop of Bombay, did much—though he is no 'low churchman'—to help forward the plan for union. No one who heard his speech on South Indian Union at the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh is likely to have forgotten the passionate conviction with which he advocated the scheme. In this pamphlet his great learning in all matters relating to English Church law and history are used to rebut the criticisms of those who are less accomplished than he in these matters, and so to remove the misunderstandings and strictures of an Open Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Superiors of certain religious communities. He discharges what he calls his uncongenial task with much patience.

Two things he never forgets in his approach to the subject—one, that this is a plan for the union of young 'missionary' Churches in the position of the Church of the first centuries, the other, that just for that reason the idea behind the plan is that the uniting churches will grow together as they come closer to each other and have deepening experience of the faith they possess together. He concludes the main part of his reply with these words: 'Those who are ready to accuse others of schism without just cause actually threaten to make a schism themselves which is obviously a schism, though they have persuaded themselves that it might become their conscientious duty. When really good men threaten to commit a sin if someone else does something else which they do not like, I do not believe that they will do any such thing.'

The fourth pamphlet is a 'Statement' by a group who might be called strongly evangelical churchmen giving the reasons why they support the union. As has been indicated above the union is in a precarious position at the present time, and it is with that danger in view that Canon Broomfield has issued his pamphlet. He is a high churchman, but like many both here and in India he is much disturbed at the possibility of this union failing after it has been sought so long and with such deep and devout desire. He accordingly presents with much earnestness and persuasiveness an alternative scheme for the unification of ministries. It accepts, of course, to begin with, that each church uniting shall fully recognize the orders of the others as valid, but that, seeking to restore the unity of the body of Christ, they will present themselves to receive through the laying on of hands, with the prayers and forms with which each Church ordains its own ministers, 'the spiritual endowment which through separation' all have lacked in its fulness. Though we all believe that our ordination, being from God, is fully effectual, yet there should be an enrichment from the entering into a wider ministry, and that can be sought and obtained from God, as we obey Him by coming together. 'Each minister serving in a united Church would receive the normal form of ordination from each of the Churches in the union. There would be a real unification of ministries.' This method, thus understood, would, it is believed, bring the union once more within the reach of the Churches in India who have laboured for it so earnestly and the way would be opened for approaches of the same kind in other lands. This is a hope that, we trust, will not be deferred or disappointed.

NICOL MACNICOL.

Principal Micklem at Kingsway Hall.

On Wednesday, May 3, the one hundred and fortieth annual meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society was held at Kingsway Hall. The meeting was a memorable one. The principal speakers were the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Principal of Mansfield College. Dr. Micklem's task was to say something about the religious situation in Europe.

'We know bits here and there of what has happened, but we are quite unable to tell the story adequately; still less do we know what has happened to the souls of men during these dark days of heavy trial.

'I think of one picture. I was told of some Christian who by chance had the opportunity of visiting the notorious Sachsenhausen concentra-

tion camp, where at that time Pastor Martin Niemöller was in solitary confinement. He was, of course, not allowed to speak to him, but it so happened that, passing through the camp, he looked through a window, and there inside he saw Niemöller sitting poring over the Bible. There he had been for many months with only the Bible and hymn-book. Think what the Bible means in a situation like that, not to him only, but to thousands in somewhat similar circumstances. I think we are apt to rely too much, especially we who come from the universities, on learned commentators. I believe in such a situation as in Europe the Bible has indeed come alive to-day. I have read all sorts of things about the prophet Daniel. Now, when I read the words of those who said, "If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not"—I need no better commentary to-day on that other situation of our persecuted brethren on the Continent of Europe. The Bible has become, I suppose, for thousands in quite a new way a living word and a contemporary word.

'I used to feel sometimes that much of the Psalms was a little out of touch with my own experience—the complaints against the wicked: "I am become like a bottle in the smoke": "I am like a pelican of the wilderness." I never felt in the least like a pelican in the wilderness! Now, when I read the Psalms I read them as our persecuted brethren on the Continent read them; and how those words come home as a living word to my ears.'

Rudyard Kipling.

A delightful little book by the late Coulson Kernahan has been issued by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net) with the captivating title: '*Nothing Quite like Kipling had Happened Before.*' The sub-title is 'Some Little Memories of a Great Man.' Kernahan was an intimate friend of Kipling. He was also one of the ablest raconteurs of his day, and the result of this combined outfit is a charming picture of Kipling from an unfamiliar angle. In his own family he was an ideal husband and father, courteous, high-spirited, the bosom friend and entertainer of his children. He was accessible and friendly to strangers and devoid of any kind of superiority.

A hint may be found by public speakers in what took place on one occasion when Kipling was addressing a meeting without referring to notes. Suddenly and unexpectedly there was a blinding blaze of light. A photographer had got permission to 'take' the platform party. But the blinding light so disconcerted Kipling that he lost the thread of his discourse. He stopped short, hesitated a moment, and then, diving into the tail pocket of his coat, produced a document and calmly read the remainder of his speech.

And there is more than a hint for preachers in the story of Edwards, the 'Fighting Parson.' The 'Fighting Parson' was a trooper in the Essex Yeomanry as well as a padre, and when the Bishop of Chelmsford visited the men in camp he said to Edwards: 'What shall I talk about?' 'Talk horses, my Lord,' was the reply. 'The Yeomanry are a mounted arm and the men are all drawn from yeoman stock.' It happened that the Bishop knew a lot about horses, and he talked horses to them so genially that the men vowed he was the best padre they had ever struck.

How morally sensitive Kipling was is illustrated by a remark he once made about alcohol. Once in America Kipling saw two young men making two very young girls drunk. Here is his comment on the incident: 'Recanting previous opinions, I became a prohibitionist. Better is it that a man should go without his beer in public places, and content himself with swearing at the narrow-mindedness of the majority; better it is to poison the inside with very vile temperance drinks, and to buy lager furtively at back doors, than to bring temptation to the lips of young fools such as the four I have seen. I understand now why the preachers rage against drink. I have said: "There is no harm in it, taken moderately"; and yet my own demand for beer helped directly to send these two girls reeling down the dark street, to God alone knows what end.' That is a striking utterance from such a source.

I close with a remarkable prediction made by Lord Roberts nine years before the event. It was made, Mr. Kernahan says, in an interview Lord Roberts gave in Quebec. He was reported to have said: 'They refuse to believe me, and we sleep under false security, for I do not hesitate to affirm that we shall have a frightful war in Europe, and that England and France will have the hardest experience of their existence. They will, in fact, see defeat very near, but the war will finally be won by the genius of a French General named Ferdinand Foch, Professor at the Military School in Paris.' There is some dubiety as to whether this was said in public or in an interview, but Kernahan is satisfied that it was said, and said in an interview.

F. J. Rae.

Union in the Desert.

Arthur wanted to join the Presbyterian Church. I agreed to admit him to membership next morning at 7 a.m., before he went on duty. Next morning Father Ronge, who was with me, had arranged for a Communion service for Anglicans. Obviously two services in such a tiny unit were unthinkable. With one voice we made the same suggestion. He was to have the Communion service as arranged and in the middle of it I would admit Arthur to the Church, and we should all join together in the Sacrament. Highly irregular perhaps, but beautifully reverent in the desert that morning at the scene of what was once a historic battlefield.[1]

[1] G. Nicholson, *Spotlight on Springbok*, 44.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.